

Also, petition of Thomas A. Sullivan, Capt. Edward Dayton, and 44 citizens of Kenosha, Wis., requesting the repeal of section 904 of the revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REBER: Petition of John Biskis and Peter Buscavage, of Tamaqua, Pa., and of Joseph Abravinsky and John A. Rutkowski, of Shenandoah, Pa., asking that the United States demand the withdrawal of Polish troops from Lithuanian territory and give to Lithuania a moral support in her war against Bolshevism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the employees of the Boston Navy Yard, urging 44-hour week for employees of United States Navy Department; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Bottlers and Drivers' Union, No. 122, in favor of the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of Nikolaus Kuhn, 3309, Thirty-eighth Place, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the United States joining the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Tenk Hardware Co., of Quincy, Ill., protesting against reduction of postal rates on advertising pages of magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Farm Implement News, Masonic Temple, Chicago, Ill., urging repeal of zone postal rate advance; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Schneider & Metzger, Peoria, Ill., urging repeal of luxury tax, and also urging that Congress put an end to inefficient administration of our railroad and express systems which are unendurable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Keith Swartz, Anti-Saloon League, Dixon, Ill.; Joseph J. Edwards, Forrest, Ill.; and Edward F. Rittenhouse, Pontiac, Ill., all urging enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, July 18, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we present ourselves to Thee and open our hearts for the reception of Thy truth. Thou hast promised that Thou wilt write Thy laws in our hearts, and in our minds Thou wilt establish them. So we pray as we journey on to the duties of this day that we may have the guidance of the inward monitor—the law that is written deep in our own hearts, that is in conformity to the will of God. May we feel that our highest obligation is to do that which is pleasing in Thy sight. So do Thou bless us this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CABLEGRAM FROM THE ARGENTINE SENATE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a cablegram from the President of the Senate of the Argentine Nation, expressing its intense satisfaction for the signing of the treaty of peace, which will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PERMANENT RANK OF SUPERIOR OFFICERS (H. DOC. NO. 153).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I take the liberty of calling your attention to a matter which I am sure is at the heart of the whole country, and which I have had very much in mind throughout all these months when we were trying to arrange a peace that would be worthy of the spirit and achievements of the men who won the victory in the field and on the sea. After mature reflection, I earnestly recommend that you give the permanent rank of general to John J. Pershing and Peyton C. March, expressing the law in such a way as to give precedence to Gen. Pershing; and that you give the permanent rank of admiral to William S. Benson and William S. Sims. I take it for granted that I am only anticipating your own thoughts in proposing these honors for the men upon whom the principal responsibilities devolved for achieving the great results which our incomparable Navy and Army accomplished.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 18 July, 1919.

PROPAGANDA FOR LEGISLATION.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, during the last two or three days my mail has been largely burdened with letters, some of which are written, some in printed form, but practically identical in language, of which this is a sample:

The writer wishes to protest against the passage of Senate bill 2202, the Kenyon bill, on account of it being unjust, un-American, and socialistic.

The bill referred to is that introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] to regulate the packing industry. My purpose in reading this communication into the RECORD is to emphasize the fact that a very obvious and a very common system of propaganda has been inaugurated against the bill.

I am not familiar with the merits of the bill; it may be subject to all the epithets which are made against it in this correspondence; but it would seem to me that those who are initiating it either have a very low opinion of the intelligence of the average Senator or else they go upon the theory that by demonstrating considerable political strength they can influence Senators in their ultimate determination of this bill. As a Member of this body I want to protest against the constant tendency to either oppose or commend to our attention bills and business before it by that method of appeal. It is becoming a nuisance and particularly to those of us who have other correspondence that is of substantial value to attend to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 7343, an act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and on motion of Mr. WARREN, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

MILITARY AIR SERVICE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, while I have the floor I want to refer to another subject briefly, and I will preface what I have to say by reading a very brief clipping from this morning's Washington Post. It is entitled "Air Service drops plans":

PLANS for the establishment of four observation air squadrons in the Philippines as part of the basic defense of the islands will have to be abandoned, Army officials said yesterday, unless some remedy is found for the present situation of the Air Service. Each of these squadrons requires 41 flying officers, and the entire commissioned personnel of the service will number only 222 by September 30.

Other important projects to be abandoned include 3 squadrons for Hawaii, 3 squadrons for Panama and 2 for the border patrol, and 40 balloon companies for the United States.

This announcement is doubtless due to the fact that the committee of conference on the Army supply bill were unable to agree upon a greater amount than \$25,000,000 for the Army Air Service, a sum which would be as well expended if it were taken out into midocean and sunk to the bottom of the sea, so far as any permanent benefit that it will confer upon our air service is concerned. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs, with practical unanimity, recommended and reported, and the Senate adopted, an appropriation of twice that amount, which was the lowest limit under the hearings that was commensurate with the adequacy and the needs of this service.

Now, I believe in economy as earnestly as any man, but I protest against that false economy which consigns this great arm of the service, both for offense and defense, into what is virtual abandonment.

Mr. President, the Air Service is the coming arm for defensive and for offensive purposes. It is so fully appreciated and recognized by our late allies in the war that they, notwithstanding their depleted finances and burden of taxation, are bending their energies and devoting large appropriations to the development of this service. We, with whom the airship originated—for it is an American invention—and who found ourselves so handicapped because of our neglect of it at the time we entered into the war, now propose to give little, if any, attention to it, in consequence of which, if trouble again arises, we shall be in the same situation in which we were when war was declared against Germany.

Mr. President, if the information which the public receive from the administration is reliable—and I hope it is—to the effect that the policy of "watchful waiting" with regard to Mexico is to be abandoned, and if we are to assume a firm attitude toward that country, we may happen to be precipitated into serious differences almost without warning. It will then

be a melancholy spectacle to the Nation, and doubtless one of great pleasure to any of our competitors, that we shall not possess a single air squadron—we, this mighty Nation, with its 100,000,000 people and with its recent experiences, notwithstanding its expenditures of \$100,000,000, will be bereft of the advantage this service affords. I want the country to understand that the Senate of the United States is not to be held responsible for this humiliating condition.

PROPAGANDA FOR LEGISLATION.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, with regard to the propaganda referred to by the Senator from Colorado, I wish to say that it is not all on the bill referred to by him; it is on nearly every bill that comes before Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. I stated that fact.

Mr. SMOOT. As far as that particular bill is concerned, I will say that I have received 10 petitions to support it against 1 in opposition to the bill.

Last Monday and Tuesday the Joint Committee on Printing held hearings on the question of what department publications should be discontinued after August 1. The representatives of the departments wherever they received an impression that any of the publications issued from their departments were to be discontinued or thought that the committee was inclined to discontinue them immediately began a propaganda by sending telegrams into nearly every State of the Union, requesting that individuals interested or subscribers immediately telegraph to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing protesting against the discontinuance of the publications.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I want to emphasize the fact that the practice is becoming so common that it is not only ineffective but it is a nuisance. My impression is that the basis of it is on the assumption that a development of strength of a political character and a combination of voters will have its effect upon the action of the Senate. Congress is not in favor of prohibition; but Congress to-day is doing the will of the prohibitionists because Members of both Houses believe that the prohibition sentiment is better organized and stronger than any other; and people are carrying on the same propaganda in different ways.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator excuse just a suggestion?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think what the Senator from Colorado just said confirms what Tom Carlyle said, that public sentiment is not what everybody thinks, but what the people charged with public duty think that everybody thinks.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have wondered who paid for these telegrams. I happen to be chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, and as to the telegrams that I have received—floods of them—protesting against the discontinuance of certain publications, I know the parties who sent the telegrams do not pay the expenses of sending them; and I know that in the case of the telegrams sent from the department the Government of the United States will have to pay for them.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. In many cases, if the Senator will permit me, the parties sending the telegrams know nothing at all about the purpose for which they are sent.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is absolutely correct. I have received telegrams calling attention, for instance, to House resolution, say, 487, and the party sending the telegram knew no more about House joint resolution 487 than a baby knows. I have written such persons many times and asked them "what particular part of the resolution do you object to?" They have answered, and said they have not even seen the resolution, know nothing about it; and yet they are paying—or some one is paying—the expense of sending telegrams. Against this propaganda that is on Congress ought to express its dissent, and I believe every Senator and every Representative ought to announce that he will pay no attention to propaganda of this kind hereafter. Of the telegrams that I have received there is no difference in wording in any of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will excuse me in this connection, I received three so-called petitions addressed to me against the league of peace upon the ground that it was surrendering the sovereignty and independence of the United States; and in each case all the signatures were in the same handwriting, and the language was exactly the same in each petition. But I do not see any right that I have to quarrel about that. People have a right to wire me, and they have a right to send petitions, and they have a right to use propaganda, and, God knows, they have a right to suppose that Representatives and Senators will be influenced by political motives, and that if a Representative or Senator thinks that he may be defeated, he will take one course; and if he thinks not, he will probably

take another. Is it not, after all, our own fault? Is it not our own cowardice? If people did not believe that, they would not bring that sort of pressure to bear on us.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection whatever to any citizen of the United States writing to any Senator or Representative; and surely I have no objection to his writing to me, provided he expresses his own opinion and provided he pays the expense. I am not speaking about such requests. I am speaking about a propaganda started by the departments themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh.

Mr. SMOOT. And the Government paying for the telegrams. I have not any doubt that there is some arrangement made by which the Government or somebody pays for the telegrams that we are receiving in this particular propaganda.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not want to be misunderstood about that. Of course, any propaganda started and carried on at the expense of the United States Government against either branch of the legislative body is wrong in every conceivable form. I was not talking about that. I was going back to the basic point at the root of all of it; and the basic point at the root of all of it is that if politicians, Senators, and Representatives were not cowards, this sort of pressure would not be here bothering us to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. There is a great deal of truth in what the Senator says.

Mr. KING and Mr. SMITH of Georgia addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Not only would it be improper to use public money, but it would be also equally as improper for public officials to take the money of parties in interest and send out telegrams at their expense while they are in public employment.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that some of the telegrams I have received protesting against the publication of certain documents have reference to documents which the committee have no idea of discontinuing at all and never have had.

I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I received a letter four or five days ago. It was unusually frank and candid, differing from many of those that are written to Senators and Congressmen. The writer stated that he had received word from a certain bureau in the Department of Agriculture that owing to the penuriousness of Congress in failing to make adequate appropriations for a certain publication it was to be discontinued or its usefulness very much minimized, and protesting against it, and insisting that we make large appropriations for the continuation of that publication. He confessed that he got his inspiration from the department; the department had written him and he was asked to write me because I had been somewhat strong in my opposition to departmental publications and bureau publications, many of which are but a waste of printer's ink and an annoyance and an unnecessary expense to the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. I think I received a protest from the same gentleman to whom my colleague has referred, and at the bottom of it there was a threat in which he predicted what would happen to me if I did not do such and such a thing. All I wish to do at this time is to call attention to the fact that I believe the departments of the Government ought to cease propaganda of this sort. If it affects me in any way it is that if I were favorable to a proposition and the head of some department began a propaganda of the kind that is going on now I would almost feel like changing my attitude, if for no other reason than to let the departments know that Senators and Representatives will act upon their judgment irrespective of what propaganda may be started.

Mr. WARREN. Apropos of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the distinguished Senator from Utah, I will ask the Secretary to read section 6 of the third deficiency appropriation act, which refers directly to this matter and which was sought to be corrected by the Committee on Appropriations, who reported that bill, which Congress passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

SEC. 6. That hereafter no part of the money appropriated by this or any other act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertise-

ment, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section, shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

Mr. WARREN. That would seem to cover the case. It is the current law, and I hope and I believe it will be enforced.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Wyoming one question before he concludes. It seems to me that that goes a little bit too far. It says except when some executive officer shall be requested by a Member of Congress. I think that every executive officer, even in the most subordinate capacity, ought to be left free to write directly to a Senator or Representative and advocate an appropriation or the cessation of one, whichever he chooses. I would suggest when the Senator finally brings the matter before the Senate that he leave that out and do not say "upon request of a Member of Congress."

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator did not hear me when I stated that it is current law, a law which was passed some weeks ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I did not hear the Senator say that, and if I had, it would not change my view that so much of it ought to be corrected at once, because undoubtedly an executive officer or the head of a bureau or department ought to be left perfectly free, upon his own initiative, to advise me or you or the Senator from Utah or any other Senator as to what he thinks would be an improvement in the law in order to better carry on the business of the Government. To make it a penal offense to do that without our request is making ourselves a lot of Prussian junkers, in a way. We do not want to do that, of course. That law ought to be corrected to that extent.

PEACE TREATY AND LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. BECKHAM. Mr. President, on Monday next, at the close of the morning business, I shall ask the privilege of addressing the Senate on the subject of the pending peace treaty and the league of nations.

TRANSFER OF SHANTUNG TO JAPAN.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I give notice that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, if the business of the Senate permits, I shall discuss the provisions of the treaty of peace relating to Shantung.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I gave notice that on the 14th instant I should take occasion to briefly present to the Senate my views with regard to certain reservations upon the peace treaty. I desire to submit to the Senate my views with reference to that matter on next Wednesday morning, provided no Senator has given notice that he desires to occupy that time. If so, with the permission of the Senate, I will discuss the matter on Friday morning at the close of morning business, not only with relation to the legal effect but also with respect to the political effect of such reservations.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that on Tuesday, July 29, I shall address the Senate on the league of nations.

MILITARY AIR SERVICE.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] referred to the possible necessity for further airplanes and some criticism of the action of Congress or of the department with reference to the discharge of officers in the service. I send to the desk a letter from the governor of New Mexico containing a telegram from the governor of Texas upon this subject, and I ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
Santa Fe, July 11, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have this day received a telegram from Hon. W. P. Hobby, governor of Texas, which is in words and figures as follows, to wit:

Gov. O. A. LARRAZOLO,
Santa Fe, N. Mex.:

Knowing the Mexican situation as I do and believing that some action by the United States Government with reference to conditions in Mexico and along the border will be necessary in the near future, I view with alarm the action of the War Department in demobilizing and discharging all officers of the National Army, which will practically wipe out the Air Service. To my mind, it is imperative that Congress make some provisions for a continuation in service of a reasonable number of the National Army officers until a permanent military policy has been established, as it would be impossible to get these trained officers, upon whom the Government has spent millions of dollars, especially in the aviation branch, back into service after being discharged. Please wire your Senators and Representatives to aid this matter.

W. P. HOBBY,
Governor of Texas.

I agree with Gov. Hobby that the policy of demobilizing and discharging the officers of the National Army now on duty, principally along the Mexican frontier, is rather an improvident one, and that at least until matters in Mexico assume a permanently peaceful and orderly condition a sufficient number of such trained officers and soldiers should be kept on duty along the border, and this, as you can readily understand, as a necessary protection to our people and interests.

I therefore suggest to you the advisability of conferring with the War Department and of calling the attention of the Secretary of War to this matter, with the request that a sufficient force, commanded by competent and trained officers, be maintained along the Mexican border until such time as their further presence there is shown to be unnecessary.

Hoping that you will attend to this request, I beg to remain,
Very sincerely, yours,

O. A. LARRAZOLO, Governor.

Hon. A. B. FALL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have not complied with the request of the governor in so far as taking up this matter with the War Department is concerned because I am informed that the War Department has no recourse; that the Congress of the United States having failed to make provision for these officers it has become necessary for the War Department to take the action which they have taken. I should like to know from the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee if that is not a correct statement of the case.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. FALL. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. As the Senator is on the floor, I desire to state that I have been to the War Department in an effort to have as many soldiers as possible kept along the international line from Texas to the California coast. I have been assured that Gen. Cabell, who is in charge of this, was keeping the War Department advised of the conditions existing, and I have been informed likewise that every possible protection would be taken to sufficiently guard the border. I confess that, judging from the letters I have received from the towns along the border of Arizona, they are not satisfied. I believe they are absolutely sincere in it and know what they are doing; and I should welcome any act, either by the department or by the Congress, that will put beyond peradventure any threatened danger to the American people along the border between the two Republics.

While I am on my feet I will say in that connection that at some later day in this session I may have something to say about the conditions in Mexico as revealed to me from public prints and from private letters, and will submit to the Congress the necessity of some steps being taken to safeguard the lives and property of the people not only on the border but those living in Mexico under the invitation, if you please, of the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona did not catch fully the statement I was making.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is true; I could not hear the Senator.

Mr. FALL. I will repeat for the Senator's benefit that I stated that I had not presented to the War Department this communication to me from the governor of New Mexico, inclosing to me the telegram from the governor of Texas, because my information was that the War Department could do nothing in the matter; that the Congress of the United States itself, by cutting off appropriations, had rendered it necessary that the War Department should discharge these officers whom these governors seem to think are so necessary for the protection of the border in the aeronautic service, and I had just requested the chairman of the committee to state whether my information was incorrect.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Before the chairman answers the question I want to inquire of the Senator if there are not enough soldiers that could be sent to that place for the proper and full

defense of that whole border without endangering the safety of the balance of the country? If there is any place in the world where we need the soldiers now, in my judgment, it is along that border.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I will take just a moment or two to express my views on that subject. I shall trespass for only a minute upon the time of the Senate.

In my judgment, sir, the trouble along the border is that the troops there have not the proper orders. In my judgment, if they were ordered to prevent raids or incursions upon this side and to take any means which they thought necessary to preserve order along the border and to protect the lives and property of American citizens one-tenth the number now on the border could do it. We have a border of very great length, 1,400 miles, practically unprotected. We have enough troops to patrol every mile of it, and more; but the difficulty is that they must so conduct themselves as not to bring this country into a possible conflict with anyone who may be temporarily exercising power in Mexico. The consequence is that the faces of our troops along the border, guarding us ostensibly from raids from the other side, are turned toward the north instead of toward the south to prevent incursions of American business men owning property in Mexico into the Republic, at least upon a great many occasions, at various points. They are attempting to prevent smuggling, as they call it, from this side to the other side, and they overlook the smuggling from the other side to this side. They do pursue a hot trail, as they call it, when they can get orders from a superior officer to pursue a hot trail; and I may say that the troops, in so far as their orders are concerned, have performed their duty magnificently. The people of the United States do not know that at least 12 times within the last 4 or 5 or 6 months the troops of the United States have gone across the Mexican border and have pursued Mexican marauders, and when they examined the bodies invariably they found the uniforms of the Carranza regular soldiers upon the bodies of at least some of those marauders whom they were pursuing. Col. Langhorne and the officers under him in the Great Bend district in Texas have done magnificent service, and if they were turned loose and told to stop it they would stop the trouble along the border.

Now, I renew the request for information from the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, with respect to the Air Service, which was discussed here a few minutes ago, we might just as well face the facts as they are. The Army appropriation bill made an exceedingly severe cut in the Air Service appropriations and brought the appropriations down to such a point, not only in the matter of the appropriation of \$25,000,000 for maintenance, operation, experiment, and construction, but also in the pay appropriation for the Army, that the Air Service is practically reduced to a shell. There will be little left of it by September 30. Between now and September 30 every emergency officer serving in the Air Service must be discharged, for the simple reason that by September 30 there will not be any money to pay such officers. The same is true in every other branch of the Army, but the effect upon the Air Service is the more serious, because it was among the emergency officers that we found our fliers.

I am informed by the Chief of the Air Service that this will leave on September 30 a total commissioned personnel in the Air Service of 232 officers. Practically all of those will have to be assigned to purely administrative duties, and we will have, in effect, no fliers at all.

It is idle to talk about the De Haviland planes, of which we have something like 3,000 in storage, in good, bad, or indifferent condition. If the present plans go through—and I think myself the War Department is quite helpless in the matter—there will be no one to fly the planes. I say "no one." There may be ten or a dozen men who might be gathered here and there out of the regular service who have become fliers during this war and who can be taken away from the administrative work; but to all intents and purposes there will be no active flying service in the Army of the United States after September 30 next.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have been somewhat critical in the past of the War Department, although not vociferously so, and I simply wanted to do that department justice in this matter, as I understood the facts about it, by saying that if there is any blame whatsoever to be placed in the particular matter under discussion it is the fault of the Congress of the United States and not the fault of the War Department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And may I interject the observation that it can hardly be said to be the fault of the Senate?

Mr. FALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee permit a question? Is it not true that 90 per cent of these planes, or a great portion of them, are to be turned back

to the original manufacturers at about 10 per cent of the cost of making them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator from Kentucky must be referring to training planes. It is true that the department is endeavoring to sell at the best figures it can the training planes, of which we have a tremendous surplus; but the only combat plane, or so-called combat plane, that we have in any quantity is the De Haviland 4, which already, I may say, is, by comparison with foreign planes, out of date, but it is a serviceable plane. The trouble is we will not have men to fly it.

Mr. STANLEY. Have we not any battle planes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The De Haviland 4 is the only plane we have which is used in aerial warfare of any kind or description.

Mr. STANLEY. Are these training planes serviceable for any other service than training planes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are not. You can not mount guns on them. You can not do active work with them. They are only to train men to fly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, are they being sold at 10 per cent of their cost?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That matter was discussed when the Army appropriation bill was before the Senate. It is true that 2,700 training planes were sold at something like 10 or 15 per cent of their original cost. Some were entirely out of condition, some were in poor condition, some were in good condition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was the reason or the excuse, whichever it may be, given for that transaction?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That nobody wanted them in large quantities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Could they not have been retailed, then, to a little bit better advantage?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, that is a question of policy. I am not prepared to defend the War Department on that point nor to criticize it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not asking the Senator to defend the War Department. I am merely asking his opinion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator asked me a question, and I am endeavoring to answer it. I can give the Senator the War Department's explanation, and I have to trust to my recollection, which may be somewhat inaccurate. According to my recollection, the War Department asserted that it would have been dangerous to sell training planes to individual citizens all over the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Because many of those planes are not in good repair, and accidents would inevitably follow their falling into the hands of individual citizens; and the War Department contended that it would be a bad policy for the Government to sell 2,700 planes, in all degrees of defective condition or lack of repair, and let them be scattered all over the country, and have crashes and accidents and complaints following. So, rather than do that, they sold a large number to the Curtiss Co., who agreed to take them just as they ran. Some of them were standing in hangars, some of them were on factory floors, some of them had flown almost to destruction, some had been flown very little. The Curtiss Co. agreed to take a certain number just as they ran, and to get them out of the country, and to let somebody else do the crashing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, if that be true, the department was justified in violating the maxim of "caveat emptor"; but are not the materials in an airplane worth more than 10 per cent of its cost, even if you are going to junk it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not tell the Senator from Mississippi. I do not know.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know, either. I thought perhaps the Senator did.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. I should like to know if the morning business is concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not started yet.

Mr. LODGE. I thought we were under the order of petitions and memorials.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are. We have had one petition.

Mr. LODGE. We are acting under that order, then. There are a number of Senators who are pretty busily engaged who have been sitting here trying to get an opportunity to dispose of some morning business. Therefore I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can have it. Are there further petitions and memorials?

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MOSES. I present resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the Friends of Irish Freedom of Walpole, N. H., remonstrating against the adoption of the covenant of the league of na-

tions. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 12, 1919.

HON. GEORGE H. MOSES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MOSES: At a mass meeting of the Friends of Irish Freedom of the Town of Walpole, N. H., held July 6, 1919, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Resolved, That we are opposed to any league of nations that does not safeguard the Monroe doctrine and the absolute right of the American people to decide for themselves what is necessary for their welfare and happiness.

"Resolved, A league of nations founded on force of millions of subject races is not a desirable amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, and we request our Senators to vote against it.

"Resolved, That we demand the freedom of Ireland and all subject races before we consider a league of nations.

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our Senators in Congress."

FRIENDS OF IRISH FREEDOM OF WALPOLE, N. H.
WM. J. KING.
PATRICK REARDON.
JOHN HEALEY.

Mr. MOSES. I present resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of sundry Lithuanian citizens of Manchester, N. H., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIANS OF MANCHESTER, N. H.,
122 Merrimack Street, July, 1919.

HON. GEORGE H. MOSES,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We, the Lithuanians of the city of Manchester, N. H., have, in mass meeting assembled, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas Lithuania was for ages an independent State, whose inhabitants, a distinct ethnic group, have never renounced their right to independence; and

"Whereas the establishment of the independent Lithuanian State would add materially to the future peace of the world: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the Lithuanians of this city and citizens of the United States of Lithuanian descent, request the United States Government, through the honorable Representative of our district and the honorable Senators of our State, to recognize the complete independence of the Lithuanian Republic."

R. KONDROTAS, *Chairman.*
J. A. ZUKAUSKAS, *Secretary.*

Mr. MOSES. I present resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of sundry Lithuanians of the Roman Catholic Parish of All Saints, of Manchester, N. H., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROMAN CATHOLIC PARISH OF ALL SAINTS,
Manchester, N. H., July 13, 1919.

To his honor GEORGE H. MOSES,
House of Senators, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We, members of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Parish of All Saints, of the city of Manchester, N. H., in a meeting assembled at Battery Building, Manchester Street, Manchester, N. H., have adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the invasion by the Polish Army of Lithuania is a brutal violation of the war aims declared by President Wilson and the allied governments, condemned by liberal opinion the world over as indefensible interference with the right of self-determination of nations;

Whereas Lithuania was for ages an independent State, whose inhabitants, a distinct ethnic group, have never renounced their right to independence: Be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the parish and American citizens of Lithuanian descent, hereby request the United States Government to compel Poland to withdraw her army from the Lithuanian territories, and that all assistance be denied to Poland as long as she continues to occupy the invaded territories; and be it further

Resolved, That we request the United States Government to recognize the present Lithuanian Government and to render it moral and material assistance.

L. J. JAKAITIS,
Chairman.
FELIX CHEKUTIS,
Secretary.

Mr. MOSES. I present resolutions adopted by Lodge No. 119, Lithuanian Roman Catholic Alliance of America, of Manchester, N. H., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROMAN CATHOLIC ALLIANCE OF AMERICA, LODGE NO. 119,
Manchester, N. H., July 13, 1919.

To his honor GEORGE H. MOSES,
House of Senators, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We, members of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Alliance of America, Lodge 119, located in the congressional district of the city of Manchester, N. H., have in a meeting assembled at the lodge hall, 153 Manchester Street, adopted the following resolution:

Whereas Lithuania was for ages an independent State, whose inhabitants, a distinct ethnic group, have never renounced their right to independence;

Whereas the establishment of an independent Lithuanian State would add materially to the future peace of the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the lodge and citizens of the United States of Lithuanian descent, request the United States Government, through the honorable Representative of our district and the honorable Senators of our State, to recognize the complete independence of the Lithuanian Republic.

L. J. JAKAITIS,
Chairman.
J. A. ZUKAUSKAS,
Secretary.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions of Midland Grange, No. 1681, Patrons of Husbandry, of Burrton; of Local Grange, No. 1812, Patrons of Husbandry, of Reno; of Ninescah Grange, No. 1878, Patrons of Husbandry, of Sylvia; and of Highland Grange, No. 1790, Patrons of Husbandry, of Topeka, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Independence, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Goodland, Kans., praying for the repeal of the tax on automobiles, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Goessel, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Harper County, Kans., praying for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, soda, soft drinks, medicines, toilet articles, clothing, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I present a communication from the League of Free Nations Association, inclosing a resolution adopted at the national conference of that association, based upon a referendum vote of its members throughout the country. I ask that the communication and accompanying resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The communication and accompanying resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF FREE NATIONS ASSOCIATION,
New York City, July 9, 1919.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Wardman Park Inn, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The inclosed resolution, based upon a referendum vote of members throughout the country, was passed last night at a national conference of this association.

Very truly, yours,

JAMES G. McDONALD,
Chairman.

Resolved, That the League of Free Nations Association, in accordance with a referendum of its full membership, calls upon all forward-looking citizens to urge the United States Senate—

1. To ratify without reservations the treaty with Germany, including the league of nations covenant.

Such ratification would establish immediate peace, the world's most urgent need, in the interest of order and progress; would abolish many international injustices which have proved prolific causes of war; and would create an agency for the rectification of remaining injustices and for the establishment of mutually advantageous and just relations between nations.

2. To accompany its ratification with a resolution, declaring it to be the purpose of the United States, as a member of the league of nations, to—

(a) Press for the immediate restoration of Kiaochow and the German concessions in Shantung to the Chinese Republic.

(b) Hold that nothing in the treaty or the covenant shall be construed as authorizing interference by the league in internal revolutions or as preventing genuine redress and readjustment of boundaries, through orderly processes provided by the league, at any time in the future that these may be demanded by the welfare and manifest interest of the people concerned.

(c) Call for the inclusion of Germany in the council of the league as soon as the new Republic shall have entered in good faith upon carrying out the treaty provisions; for the inclusion of Russia as soon as the Russian people establish stable government; and for the full participation of both Germany and Russia on equal footing in all economic intercourse as the best insurance against any reversion to the old scheme of balance of power, economic privilege, and war.

(d) Press for the progressive reduction of armaments by all nations.

(e) Throw its whole weight in behalf of such changes in the constitution and such developments in the practice of the league as will make it more democratic in its scheme of representation, its procedure more legislative and less exclusively diplomatic; an instrument of growth invigorated and molded by the active, democratic forces of the progressive nations.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented memorials of employees of the Hood Rubber Co., of Watertown; of the H. J. Heinz Co.; of Charles H. Horne & Co., of Averill; of the Hazen-Brown Co., of Boston; of the Truscon Steel Co., of Boston; of the Ideal Vogue Shoe Co., of Averill; of Kenworthy Bros. Co., of Stoughton; of the Babson Statistical Organization; of the Loose-Wiles Biscuit Co., of Boston; of the Rice, Barton & Fales Co., of Worcester; of Robert G. Pratt & Co.; of George C. Vaughan, of Peabody; of the Angier Chemical Co., of Boston; of Putnam & Cross, of Lynn; of the Weber Piano Co.; of Rogers Lunt & Bowles Co.; of the Bicknell-Thomson Co., of Greenfield;

of the Columbia Steel & Shafting Co., of Boston; of the Hunt-Spiller Manufacturing Co., of Boston; of Robbins Gamwell & Co., of Pittsfield; of Wadsworth, Howland & Co., of Boston; of the John Hood Co., of Boston; of the Springfield Printing & Binding Co.; of the L. E. Knott Apparatus Co.; of the Beaver Mills, of North Adams; of the American Bosch Magneto Corporation; of John P. Squire & Co.; of the Barrett Co.; of Whitney & Co., of Leominster; of the Globe Automatic Sprinkler Co.; of the Cheney Bigelow Wire Works, of Springfield; of the J. D. Clark Co., of Rochdale; of the Standard Plunger Elevator Co., of Worcester; of the Potter Drug & Chemical Co., of Malden; of the Burmus Paper Co. (Inc.); of the United Button Co.; of the Spencer Box Co.; of the Sulpho-Naphthol Co.; of the A. E. Little Co., of Brockton; of the Wire Goods Co., of Worcester; of the Merrimack Manufacturing Co., of Lowell; of C. B. Sampson, of Holyoke; of the Armour Leather Co., of Boston; and of the Baker-Vawter Co., of Holyoke, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. ROBINSON presented resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the St. Francis levee district of Arkansas, in annual meeting at Bridge Junction, Ark., favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Braxton County, W. Va., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2847) providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, which was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 793) authorizing the issuance of patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club (Rept. No. 88); and

A bill (S. 794) granting lands for school purposes in Government town sites on reclamation projects (Rept. No. 89).

REV. E. M. MALLORY AND REV. E. BELL.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably with amendments Senate resolution 124, submitted by Mr. SMITH of Georgia on the 17th instant, and I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, in line 1, before the word "is," to strike out "Secretary of State" and insert "President"; in the same line, after the word "hereby," to strike out "directed" and insert "requested"; in line 2, after the word "Senate," to insert "if not incompatible with the public interest"; in line 3, after the word "in," to strike out "his," and in the same line, after the word "possession," to insert "of the State Department," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to furnish to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, the records in the cases and all papers in possession of the State Department connected with the cases of Rev. E. M. Mallory, charged with harboring criminals, and Rev. E. Bell, charged with involuntary homicide, they being citizens of the United States and residents at the time in Korea.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I have received a number of communications from parties acquainted, as they thought, with the facts complaining very bitterly of trials or alleged trials in Korea and of treatment of our citizens as well as the natives and other citizens. I did not present to the Senate or make public those communications; I thought it hardly wise to do so; but when these two cases were brought to my attention, when two alleged trials of American missionaries in Korea were referred to, with the further statement that the records were in the State Department, and that they would give us an appreciation of what was taking place, I felt that at least we ought to have those records, as requested by those who wrote to us, and find out from them, if we could, something of an accurate character. It was for that reason that I offered the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. MYERS. I present the report of the Committee on Public Lands on Senate bill 183, with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 90) thereon. It is a bill introduced by my colleague [Mr. WALSH], and is intended to afford partial relief to the homesteaders on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in Montana. They have suffered from terrible drought for three years. I ask that the bill be read, and then I shall ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who has made homestead entry under the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 30, 1908 (35 Stats. L. p. 558), entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all the surplus lands after allotment," may obtain an extension of time for one year from the anniversary of the date of entry last preceding the passage of this act within which to pay the one-half of the installment then due or such part of any preceding installment, where payment has not yet been made and where an extension of time therefor is not authorized by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stats. L. p. 994), by paying interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum on the sums to be extended from the maturity of the unpaid installments to the expiration of the period of extension, the interest to be paid to the receiver of the land office for the district in which the lands are situated, within such time as may be prescribed for that purpose by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the one-half of any installment which becomes due within one year from the passage of this act and for which an extension of time for payment is not authorized by the said act of March 2, 1917, may also be extended for a period of one year by paying interest thereon in advance at the said rate: *Provided further*, That any payment so extended may annually thereafter be extended for a period of one year in like manner, but no payment shall be extended beyond eight years from the date entry nor shall any extension be granted for less than one year: *And provided further*, That if commutation proof is submitted all the unpaid payments must be made at that time.

Sec. 2. That moneys paid as interest provided for herein shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the Fort Peck Indians, the same as moneys realized from the sale of the lands.

Sec. 3. That the failure of an entryman to make any payment that may be due, unless the same be extended, or to make any payment extended either under the provisions hereof or under the provisions of the said act of March 2, 1917, at or before the time to which such payment has been extended, shall forfeit the entry and the same shall be canceled, and any and all payments theretofore made shall be forfeited.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments were, on page 2, line 17, after the word "may," to strike out "annually," and in line 18, after the word "manner," to strike out "but no payments shall be extended beyond eight years from the date of entry, nor shall any extension be granted for less than one year," so as to read:

That any person who has made homestead entry under the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 30, 1908 (35 Stat. L. p. 558), entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all the surplus lands after allotment," may obtain an extension of time for one year from the anniversary of the date of entry last preceding the passage of this act within which to pay the one-half of the installment then due, or such part of any preceding installment, where payment has not yet been made and where an extension of time therefor is not authorized by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. L. p. 994), by paying interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum on the sums to be extended from the maturity of the unpaid installments to the expiration of the period of extension, the interest to be paid to the receiver of the land office for the district in which the lands are situated within such time as may be prescribed for that purpose by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the one-half of any installment which becomes due within one year from the passage of this act and for which an extension of time for payment is not authorized by the said act of March 2, 1917, may also be extended for a period of one year by paying interest thereon in advance at the said rate: *Provided further*, That any payment so extended may thereafter be extended for a period of one year in like manner: *And provided further*, That if commutation proof is submitted all the unpaid payments must be made at that time.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes. I give notice that I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill for consideration immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2527) to amend section 4875 of the Revised Statutes, to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NUGENT:

A bill (S. 2528) to grant certain lands to the city of Pocatello, State of Idaho, for conserving and protecting the source of its water supply and as a municipal park site; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 2529) to appropriate money for the relief of impoverished and suffering homesteaders and other farmers in the drought-stricken western regions of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:

A bill (S. 2530) to authorize an advance to the "reclamation fund" for the prompt completion of drainage work on the Rio Grande project (Texas-New Mexico), and other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 2531) donating a captured cannon or fieldpiece and cannon balls to the town of Follansbee, Brooke County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 2532) to incorporate the Private Soldiers' and Sailors' Legion of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2533) granting an increase of pension to George E. Guthrie (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 2534) granting an increase of pension to Anton Mazzanovich (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

PRICE OF COAL.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I offer a resolution which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee on Contingent Expenses, and also that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce if that is in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 126) was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Whereas for several years the price of coal to the consumer has from time to time been largely increased; and
Whereas for a period this increase in price was attributed to existing war conditions; and

Whereas in spite of the fact that since the armistice was signed, November 11, 1918, normal peace conditions have prevailed, the price of coal has continued to rise, without any apparent economic or other proper reason therefor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, be instructed to make inquiry into the cause or causes which have brought about the enormous increase in the market price of coal, and to that end obtain full data regarding freight rates, wages, profits, and other matters bearing upon the question under consideration, with a view to determining who or what may be responsible for such increase in price, whether due to economic causes, and, therefore, proper and right, or whether due to manipulation or profiteering on the part of miners, shippers, or dealers in coal.

Resolved further, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized and directed to subpoena witnesses and compel their attendance, to send for persons and papers, and do such further acts as may be necessary to secure any and all information desired in the furtherance of said inquiry.

Resolved further, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce shall report its findings to the Senate, together with such recommendations as may be pertinent and advisable, with a view either to congressional or Executive action, in order to remedy existing conditions or the punishment of any individual or corporation deemed guilty of unlawful acts.

Resolved further, That the expense of the aforesaid inquiry be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING LAW.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I send to the Secretary's desk a short communication from the Farmers' Union and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

615 WOODWARD BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1919.

DEAR SIR: We are glad that there is still a chance for the repeal of the daylight-saving law, as all farmers are interested in seeing this done at the earliest possible moment.

This is a question upon which the farmers are of one opinion. They are absolutely unanimous in their opposition to this law and have

been from the day it went into effect. It is not only a great inconvenience to them, but in many cases proves an absolute loss and waste to them.

The farmers were told during the war that they must expect to make greater sacrifices than any other class. They were practically the only business men who worked without a "cost plus" in some form. They were the only laborers who never went on a strike, no matter how long the hours or how little the pay. Now, the daylight-saving law, along with other things, has been instrumental in creating dissatisfaction among farm laborers. They have borne all this patiently up to the time when there can be no legitimate excuse for a continuance of such unjust legislation.

Farmers do not have access to the President as do the organizations that are advocating the continuance of this law. They feel sure that if the President was closer in touch with the situation and knew the hardships this law works upon them and that they are unanimously against it he would not want them to bear this unnecessary burden longer. You have been on the ground continuously and know the feeling of the farmers in this matter, and we feel that we may depend on you to see that this unjust and unnecessary law is repealed at once.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN A. SIMPSON,
President.

E. A. CALVIN,
Washington Representative,
Association Farmers' Union Presidents.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article entitled "The league of nations," written by William H. Fleming, of Georgia. Mr. Fleming was formerly a Representative in the Congress of the United States. I served with him there either one or two terms, I have forgotten now which. He is a remarkably good lawyer and a very clear reasoner, and he has written an article which, I think, will aid the public and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to understand the legal situation with regard to the league of peace, especially upon the question of the surrender of sovereignty and independence, that has been so much argued; and I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(By William H. Fleming, former Congressman Tenth District of Georgia.)

We people in America did not pay the price nor bear the agony of France and Belgium and England and Italy in the World War. Yet the pages of history afford no nobler example of devotion to liberty, of loyalty to humanity, of service to brother man, and of duty to God than when America pledged her life, her fortune, and her sacred honor that the Hun should not crush out our Christian civilization.

Victory has been achieved, but not without the sacrifice of seven and a half million of human lives and a waste of wealth almost inconceivable.

Some of the leading statesmen of the world met at the Paris conference, and many other statesmen who were not there lent their counsel and advice—notable among the number being Hon. William Howard Taft, whose noble patriotism leaves no place for narrow partisanship. Under the direction of these leading minds, hundreds of experts, embracing every line of industry, of politics, of law and of government, labored for months. As a result of their work and wisdom, in dealing with the most difficult and complicated situation that ever faced any set of men, a treaty of peace has been formulated. That treaty has been signed by the delegates at Versailles and awaits only formal ratification by the proper authorities of the nations involved in the conflict.

Under our Government it is the prerogative of the United States Senate to act upon all treaties when presented to it by the President. That body is now asked by some of its Members to reject this treaty of peace, or to so amend it as to block its present operation, and thus delay the return of peace to an anxious and suffering world.

Some of these opponents of ratification are men of high position in our public life. They must have some reasons, more or less satisfactory to themselves, for their obstructive action at this critical stage.

Evidently we can not afford to oppose ratification on the mere authority of the great names appearing among the obstructionists—for if we accept that principle for our guidance, we are met with the authority of still greater names in favor of ratifying the treaty. We, the people, must therefore examine for ourselves into the validity of the objections.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS PROPERLY EMBODIED IN TREATY OF PEACE.

In the first place, and regardless of its provisions, we are told that the league of nations ought not to have been embodied in the treaty of peace.

This criticism, when subjected to analysis, appears illogical to the extent almost of insincerity. Of course any man who really believes that concerted action by the civilized nations of the world to enforce peace is in itself an undesirable and

abominable thing is fully justified in saying that the league ought not to have been embraced in the treaty. That man is opposed to the league in the treaty or out of it.

But taking it for granted, as we surely may, that the league to enforce peace is a thing to be desired, as a forward step in the higher development of world affairs, by which peace-loving democracies may combine their powers to protect themselves and weaker peoples against aggression of war-loving nations, then it is patent that to have neglected to take advantage of the one great opportunity presented by the peace conference at Paris would have been almost a crime. At the least, it would have been a blunder in diplomatic strategy, and we have the saying of a famous French diplomat that in such matters a blunder is worse than a crime.

Had not The Hague Tribunal labored for years in vain to get unity of action for peace among the nations? Did not Germany thwart every effort in that direction, because she was confident of her superior power and intended to bring on a war of conquest for her own aggrandizement?

But the developments of the war brought about a sudden change in the attitude of nations in regard to this issue. When Prussianism was in defeat, and all the peoples of central Europe, exhausted in man power and in wealth, stood aghast at the unspeakable horrors of the bloody conflict, it was then that the world, as never before, was ready to listen to those men of vision who pleaded that the powers of righteousness should combine against the powers of evil, and thus promote the happiness and prosperous development of both good and bad.

Such an opportunity to serve mankind would probably not have come again in a hundred years. We should be thankful that our President had the intuition of genius to seize the occasion for the accomplishment of this great mission, and also that he had the moral courage to stand by his convictions.

With confident assurance we may accept it as a fortunate fact that the league of nations was put in the right place at the right time.

The founding of this league of nations will, no doubt, be held by students of history in future years as one of the great blessings of the World War that balances off to some extent its terrible evils of suffering and loss.

THE LEAGUE AND THE CONSTITUTION.

Again, we are told by some of those conscientious objectors in the Senate and out of it that our Constitution forbids our entering into such a league.

From the beginning of our Government we have had much discussion about the proper location of the dividing line between State rights and National rights under our Constitution, but by no possibility can that time-worn issue be dragged into the consideration of the acceptance or rejection of the treaty of peace.

The Constitution itself expressly says in Article I, section 10, paragraph 1, that no State shall "enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation."

The full power of treaty making is vested in the President and the Senate, acting by a two-thirds vote of those present. (Art. II, sec. 2, par. 2.) In our foreign relations States are unknown. Abroad there is but one flag, the flag of the Union.

The Supreme Court of the United States, speaking through Justice Field in 133 United States, page 266, says that the treaty power extends "to all proper subjects of negotiation" between our Government and the Governments of other nations. After stating that a treaty can not do what the Constitution forbids, nor change the nature of the National Government nor of the State government, nor cede any portion of the territory of a State without its consent, Justice Field adds:

But with these exceptions it is not perceived that there is any limit to the questions that can be adjusted touching any matter which is properly the subject of negotiation with a foreign country.

Thomas Jefferson is on record as holding that the treaty-making power extends to all subjects "usually regulated by treaty."

However, if the authority of the Supreme Court and of Thomas Jefferson fails to carry conviction to any adherent of the doctrine of State rights, surely such adherent will not question the authority of John C. Calhoun, the most profound and logical expounder of the Constitution as related to that doctrine.

When Mr. Calhoun was Secretary of State under President Tyler, he addressed a letter on June 28, 1844, to Mr. Wheaton, then American minister to Prussia, in which he used the following language:

The treaty-making power has indeed been regarded to be so comprehensive as to embrace, with few exceptions, all questions that can possibly arise between ourselves and other nations, and which can only be adjusted by their mutual consent, whether the subject matter be comprised among the delegated or reserved powers.

The framers of our Constitution have not deserved the praise heaped upon them by historians and statesmen if a defect should now be discovered in that document which compels us to refuse cooperation in the greatest organized movement ever undertaken for the welfare of mankind. They made no such blunder, and we wear no such shackles.

OUR TREATY WITH PANAMA.

Following up the general objection as to the unconstitutionality of the treaty and the league, the critics specify by alleging that we have no constitutional right to stand sponsor for the liberty or independence of any foreign nation, and that such action would be without precedent.

In answer, let us look to the record.

On November 18, 1903, Hon. John Hay, our Secretary of State, signed a convention with the Republic of Panama for the construction of the ship canal; on February 23, 1904, ratification was advised by the Senate, and on February 26, 1904, proclamation of the treaty was duly made. The very first article of that treaty reads as follows:

The United States guarantees, and will maintain, the independence of the Republic of Panama.

If we had the constitutional power to guarantee the independence of Panama, why have we not the same power to cooperate with other leading nations of the world to guarantee the independence of Belgium and Poland and other members of the league? Evidently it is not a question of power but of policy.

THE LEAGUE AND AMERICANISM.

But the point about which the enemies of the league seem to concentrate their heaviest artillery is article 10, which reads as follows:

The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

We are told by some of these objectors that such a covenant is un-American; that it is a surrender of American sovereignty; and that no red-blooded American should submit to it, and so forth. And one excited alarmist in the Senate has sworn an oath that he would not vote for the treaty even though Christ himself should approve it.

ROOSEVELT FAVORED ARTICLE 10.

In the midst of these direful forebodings we can derive some comfort at least by turning to the words of a man whose red-blooded Americanism no one can doubt, and whose standard, ever in the front of the battle like the white plume of Navarre, was the political rallying point for millions of his devoted countrymen.

When President Roosevelt had been awarded the Nobel peace prize for his great service in bringing about the peace of Portsmouth, between Russia and Japan, and had returned from his trip to Africa, and was making his triumphal journey through Europe, he went to Christiania, Norway, to receive his distinguished honor in formal manner from the hands of the Nobel peace committee.

The date was May 5, 1910. His audience was the world. The occasion was one that will be ever memorable in history. The opportunity called for the best of truth and wisdom that was in the heart and head of this orator-statesman from America. He rose to the situation then, full of pure patriotism and free of petty partisanship.

He made two carefully prepared addresses. In one he spoke thus:

In the end I firmly believe that some method will be devised by which the people of the world as a whole will be able to insure peace as it can not now be insured.

How soon that end will come I do not know; it may be far distant, and until it does come I think that while we should give all the support that we can to any possible feasible scheme for quickly bringing about such a state of affairs, yet we should meanwhile do the more practicable, though less sensational things.

Let us advance step by step; let us, for example, endeavor to increase the number of arbitration treaties and enlarge the methods for obtaining peaceful settlements. Above all, let us strive to awaken the public international conscience, so that it shall be expected, and expected efficiently, of the public men responsible for the management of any nation's affairs, that those affairs shall be conducted with all proper regard for the interests and well being of other powers, great or small.

There we heard him appealing to the conscience of the world, as we so often heard him appeal to the conscience of America.

In his other address he was even more definite in its application to present world conditions, and said:

Finally, it would be a master stroke if these great powers bent on peace would form a league of peace, not only to keep the peace among themselves, but to prevent by force, if necessary, its being broken by others.

After reading those brave words let no American who believed in Roosevelt consent to striking out article 10 from the league of nations. We might well charge that article 10 was paraphrased from the speech of this great American.

ROOSEVELT FORETELLS THE COMING OF WILSON.

But again, and chiefly, as if touched with the spirit of prophecy, Mr. Roosevelt said:

As things are now, such power to command peace throughout the world could best be assured by some combination between those great nations which sincerely desire peace and have no thought themselves of committing aggressions.

The combination might at first be only to secure peace within certain definite limits and certain definite conditions; but the ruler or statesman who would bring about such a combination would have earned his place in history for all time, and his title to the gratitude of mankind.

It is no reflection on Mr. Roosevelt for us of this day to suggest that perhaps he thought it possible sufficient years were left to him to win again the Presidency of the United States, and from that vantage point of power realize in himself his vision of that coming statesman.

Fate dashed his hopes. Death closed his eyes upon that entrancing prospect. But his prophecy was fulfilled in Woodrow Wilson, the veritable man he foretold, who has, indeed, "earned his place in history for all time and his title to the gratitude of mankind."

WM. H. FLEMING.

AUGUSTA, GA., July 2, 1919.

ALSATIAN POTASH.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of the magazine called "Victory—An Illustrated Magazine of Franco-American Relations," and I ask that a short article contained in it on Alsatian products be printed in the Record, for the information of the Senate.

I do not know how many Senators here have been importuned by their former constituents to do something in relation to the present situation as to the price of potash; but at the present time the farmers are compelled to pay an exceedingly high price for potash. I understand that there is an embargo against Alsatian potash, formerly German potash, now under the control of France, and it has been stated that the price of potash has been inordinately high on account of this embargo. The statement has also been made that France could not supply us with potash for several years. This article gives certain facts and contradicts the impression which has been gained that potash could not be imported from France. If something could be done to satisfy the industry here in America and at the same time release this potash for importation, the farmers of the country would be greatly benefited.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that those interested in the subject may be informed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the article being printed, but I wish to ask the Senator what he means by "something being done" for the producers of potash here? Does he mean that he wants a duty placed upon the importation of potash, so as to make it more expensive to the farmers than it otherwise would be?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No. I want the embargo at the present time placed upon the importation of potash by the War Trade Board taken off.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that that has been done.

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The embargo has been raised. At least, I saw a publication in the Washington Post the other day to that effect. I do not know—nobody can believe anything he sees in a newspaper, necessarily—but if not done it soon will be, and if any request of ours will help to do it, all the better, of course.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will say to the Senator that I have requested not only the War Trade Board but the Department of Agriculture to do something in the matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, my information is that the Senator from Mississippi is in error about potash being taken off the embargo list. I think it is included in the embargo.

Mr. LODGE. It certainly is. So are dyestuffs.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; so are dyestuffs. I think the Senator from New Jersey is entirely right. We ought to take that embargo off and let the foreign potash come in.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It states that dyestuffs from Germany and potash from Saxony were not released from the embargo, but the Alsatian potash was. I may be mistaken.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the Senator from Mississippi will read the article, he will ascertain that the principal supply of potash will come from Alsace; and, if the embargo is lifted, our farmers in this country, instead of paying \$170 a ton for potash, which they need for the production of their crops, will be paying \$50 or \$60 a ton.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When was that article written?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. July, 1919, this month.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the date of publication; but when was it written? Does the Senator know?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not know.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am inclined to think it was written about the close of the war. But whether that is true or not, the resolution can not do any harm. It is of the utmost importance to the cotton planters very much more than anybody else, because they use more potash in proportion to hydrogen and other fertilizers than do almost any other producers of plants.

Mr. SMOOT. Potash is to be discussed in the near future in the House of Representatives. If there is any duty placed upon it, it must originate there. I am not going to object to this article going in the Record; but I wish to say that the farmers may be able to buy potash a little cheaper if the embargo is lifted and the importation allowed to come into this country free of duty until the American industry is destroyed that has been established in the production of potash in this country. But after that happens I do not know whether they will be able to buy it for any less than they are buying it to-day or not.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish I really thought there has been a potash industry successfully established in this country. I am looking for the facts. I hope it has been done, but I am a little afraid it has not.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator it has been successfully established; I have not any doubt of it; and if an embargo were placed on potash importations I think within the next 12 months there would be potash produced in this country sufficient for its needs. I have not the time, I will say to the Senator—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The prices which the producers of potash we are talking about are asking to be paid are exorbitant.

Mr. SMOOT. That came about because of the fact that the war was on, and every country wanted unusual quantities of potash for munition purposes. They required the potash, and it made no difference what price the producer asked, it was paid. But that is not what the American producer is expecting in the future. The American producers expect to make a business of it in this country and to produce potash sufficient for the needs of the country, and if we allow them a fair chance I have no doubt they will produce it at a fair price.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to suggest to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], with reference to the first resolution which he introduced, that if the Senate is going to inquire particularly into the high cost of all the articles which we are now consuming, we will have nothing much to do but that. The price of coal is high because every basic element that enters into the cost of coal is high. Wages have been increased. The price of steel has been very largely increased. Everything that the coal producer has to buy has largely increased in cost, but more particularly wages have increased. The same thing has happened with reference to coal that has happened with reference to cotton, cotton oil, and with reference to everything the farmer produces. I am quite sure the Senator has no objection if investigation is to be made along these lines that it should include the entire subject of the high cost of living at this particular time and not one particular subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to printing in the Record the article referred to by the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

(From Victory for July, 1919.)

"ALSATIAN POTASH.

"Since the signing of the armistice it seems that a campaign has been carried on in America against the importation of potash from Alsace. This campaign is of more or less German origin, although some of its leaders maintain that we must not deal with Germany, and others that American industry would suffer; finally some say that France would not have enough potash for home consumption if we permitted its importation.

"A quick survey of the question will show that the real situation is quite different from that which is presented in certain American newspapers.

"I.—Potash industry in America.

"BEFORE THE WAR—GERMAN IMPORTS.

"The potash industry began in the United States in 1914. Before that date Germany was the chief potash-producing country. In 1913 the Kalis Syndicate had extracted, from the Stassfurt mines alone, 11,800,000 tons of crude salts and had manufactured 1,650,000 tons of concentrated salts. When the war came the cessation of the importation of potash was a great blow to

America, which, before the war, had made use of a fleet of 250 steamships for the sole purpose of importing potash from Germany.

"In view of the fact that the price of potash rose to 2,000 and 2,500 francs a ton for chloride of potassium, as compared with a former price of 195 francs, American business men realized how hard it was to have to depend upon the outside world for essential products.

"Before the war the amount of potash used in the United States was as follows: In 1910, 244,900 tons; in 1912, 216,000 tons; in 1913, 231,000 tons.

"Every year about 220,000 tons were used in agriculture and 10,000 tons in chemical industries. This potash was furnished almost entirely by Germany, and the value of imports in 1913 reached \$18,073,685. In 1914 only 207,000 tons were imported; in 1915 the amount dropped to 134,000 tons.

"DURING THE WAR—AMERICAN PRODUCTION.

"During the war the production of American potash amounted in 1916 to 35,739 short tons; in 1917 to 126,961 short tons; in 1918 to 192,587 short tons. It was obtained from different sources—from the salt waters of Searles Lake, from California, and from the lakes of Nebraska; also from the dust of cement furnaces and from seaweed along the Pacific coast. Some have even attempted to produce potash as a by-product in beet-sugar refining. One company, the Oxnard Sugar Factory, manufactured 100 tons in this way in 1918.

"All these processes, however, are very costly and were only developed in consequence of the practically entire suppression of imports; in 1917 imports amounted only to 8,100 tons, sources being as follows: Russia, 17 per cent; Chili, 17 per cent; England, 15 per cent; Italy, 10 per cent; Japan, 14 per cent; other countries, 32 per cent.

"The importation of potash from France was very small before the war and fell from 1,000 tons, worth \$84,400 in 1914, to 83 tons, worth \$5,200 in 1915.

"PRESENT SITUATION AND FUTURE NEEDS.

"Since the signing of the armistice, because of the drop in price of potash, certain American processes of manufacture have been abandoned. It was due to this that two companies failed—the Diamond Match Co. and the Hercules Powder Co., both of whom extracted potash from seaweed and sea wrack.

"II.—Actual conditions in the German potash industry.

"Germany, in spite of the loss of Alsace-Lorraine, remains, because of the importance of the Stassfurt mines, a formidable opponent.

"In December, 1918, the Minister of Agriculture in Washington gave out that 'even under the most favorable conditions it would be impossible to obtain French potash in the United States before June 1.' This statement, which can easily be explained by the change in régime of the Alsace-Lorraine mines, was exaggerated by the Germans, and on January 17 a dispatch of the Associated Press announced that because of the needs of France no authorization for importing Alsatian potash into the United States could be obtained for two or three years at least. This statement is not based upon facts.

"Besides, the manufacturers of the State of Nebraska tried to put an obstacle in the way of shipments of 500,000 to 600,000 tons of potash which were to have been sent to the United States in the ships that returned from France.

"The total German production of 1917 was 1,004,285 tons, as compared with 1,110,274 tons in 1914; however, the loss of the Alsatian mines will reduce these figures. On the other hand, German consumption has enormously increased. Germany, therefore, will not be able to export any potash unless she greatly increases the production of the Stassfurt Basin, which, before the war, was already being worked to its full extent.

"III.—The Alsatian Basin.

"In 1869 rock salt was discovered at Dornach, near Mulhausen; however, it was not until 35 years later, in 1904, that three Alsations formed a company to develop the resources of sea coal and petroleum in the valley of Nonnenbruch. Rock salt was discovered at a depth of 358 meters; then, at 645 and 725 meters, two layers that were recognized as being potash.

"Finally, this potash bed was found to extend over approximately 200 square kilometers, mostly under the forest of Nonnenbruch, northwest of Mulhausen.

"Its depth varies from 500 meters in the south to 800 meters in the north. According to calculations based upon these investigations, the entire bed includes 1,472,000,000 tons of useful products, of which at least 300,000,000 tons are pure potash. These mines cover an area extending from the foothills of the Vosges to Mulhausen, Cerny, and Soultz.

"The Industrial Society of Mulhausen has figured that the lower layer of potash covers 172,000,000 square meters and the

upper layer 84,000,000 square meters—in a word, that the total production would amount to nearly 70,000,000,000 francs.

"The Alsatian salts are greatly superior in quality to those of Stassfurt; the latter need to be put through an expensive process in order to separate the chloride of potassium from the chloride of magnesium. The Alsatian mineral contains no magnesium. It is necessary merely to crush the mineral when it comes from the mines in order to obtain salts for agriculture.

"The consumption of potash salt in France will undoubtedly increase in the future, and the development of the Alsace-Lorraine potash beds will permit France to play an important rôle among potash-exporting countries.

"In 1914 the output of the Alsace-Lorraine beds was more than 40,000 tons, and this was far from representing the possible output, for the Germans did not wish to make Alsace-Lorraine a serious competitor of the Stassfurt mines. Thus the owners of the latter mines succeeded in reducing the Alsatian output to a minimum and to keep prices high by this means.

"German propaganda in the United States has attempted to spread the idea that France would be opposed to the export of Alsatian potash, especially to the United States.

"IV.—France offers to ship potash to the United States.

"Because of all the facts above mentioned, the idea prevails in the United States that France refuses to allow the exportation of potash. This idea is false. A telegram from President Wilson, dated April 28, announces that 'France offers to ship potash to the United States' under conditions favorable to America, where the price of potash has risen six times as high as that paid for German potash before the war.

"In 1916 a representative of the American Potash Syndicate maintained that the price of potash, extracted from the lakes of Nebraska, could advantageously compete with prices of German potash in America before the war. He tried to prove that potash sold at from \$20 to \$40 a ton. But a recent statement of potash producers shows that the real price is double this, or four times the price of Alsatian potash that was sent to Rotterdam.

"Therefore, for 10 years the United States has sustained an enormous loss in order to encourage the development of potash in America; and for 4 years this industry has been allowed to develop freely, without competition, under shelter of a protecting tariff. Capital has easily been procured to build factories, but most of them have failed. More than 100 licenses have been taken out, but none has had real commercial value.

"The French Government is considering sending Alsatian potash by boat, via Rouen to Havre; moreover, they contemplate sending a qualified Alsatian representative to organize sales upon arrangement with American business houses.

"V.—Conclusion.

"Alsatian potash imported to the United States will, therefore, be three times less expensive than that produced here. Unless the price of American potash is greatly reduced (which is hardly likely) it will be profitable to only a small number of producers to prohibit the importation of the Alsatian product. To do so would be contrary to the interests of agriculturists, farmers, and general consumers; in a word, to practically the entire population of the United States, since the fall in price of articles of primary importance, such as cotton, fruits, cereals, tobacco, potatoes, etc., depends upon the abundance of crops.

"In closing we may state that the exportation of Alsatian potash is one of the means that will permit France to pay for a part of the articles she receives from America, and that in this way it will stimulate the foreign commerce of the United States."

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have a very short article, written by Frederic R. Coudert, the very worthy son of a very noble sire. The article is entitled "The League Basis for a Better World System." I request that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE LEAGUE BASIS FOR A BETTER WORLD SYSTEM.

(By Frederic R. Coudert.)

[The following clear and brief outline of reasons why the people of the United States should support the plan for a league of nations now before the Paris conference is contributed to this magazine by an authority of recognized international distinction.]

"I.

"The league is the result of the logic of events rather than of the will of statesmen or of the theories of political philosophers. Nationalism, in many respects a beneficent principle, is also in many cases a disruptive force. It succeeded to and replaced those traditions of European unity embodied in the concept of the Roman Imperium. The national movement slowly develop-

ing through the eighteenth century and breaking out with fury during the French Revolution, led, like the Reformation, to a quarter of a century of war. Present conditions in Europe are calculated to lead to indefinite warfare in the attempt to realize national aspirations. Such warfare can only be avoided by co-operative action upon the part of the great nations. Necessary self-interest at a time of continuing peril dictates a permanent league of nations as in similar fashion the temporary union of free democratic peoples was essential to save civilization from the assault of Prussianism.

" II.

"The instinct of peoples the world over understands this necessity. Two powerful forces or ideas are at work—that which makes for national self-consciousness and that which aims at a wider organization of humanity. They are the two great dynamic forces of world politics to-day. Nationality must be recognized and its rights asserted and maintained not by an appeal to force but to the association of nations which, having recognized in principle the justice of those claims, is now creating a mechanism for overcoming the difficulties incident to their just application.

" III.

"The league of nations has been injured by its more enthusiastic adherents who, in declaring that it will end war and inaugurate the millennium, play into the hands of its enemies.

"What it can do and will do is to adopt federation as a working principle under which the nations may maintain their national existence without necessary recourse to war. This principle has made America what it is; its application can alone save Europe from an indefinite vista of conflict.

" IV.

"The pivot upon which the league of nations must mainly revolve is the solidarity of the English-speaking Commonwealths. With France we will always have close, sympathetic, cooperative relations. No greater task devolves upon the American citizen to-day than to strive for good fellowship with those who have the same language, the same common law, kindred institutions, a common consciousness of right and wrong, and whose combined power in men and resources could defy militant aggression from almost any combination of powers seeking world domination by force.

" V.

"The United States can not live and, in fact, never has lived in isolation. The Seven Years' War, as well as those wars incident to the French Revolution and Napoleon, involved the American Colonies and the American Nation. That we can be indifferent to nothing which threatens world strife the war has proved. Our undivided duty is to work for the Federal principle and its practical application, through methods which will ever grow by practice and experience more efficient.

" VI.

"Thus the success of the league of nations already existent will depend most largely upon American opinion. It is the duty of all interested in bringing about a better world system to educate that opinion and to create a 'state of mind' favorable to international cooperation. In order that this may be effected, partisanship must be eliminated, superficial objections answered, erroneous ideas of national sovereignty, mostly 'made in Germany,' put aside, and moral and intellectual approval of the Nation marshaled behind its President spokesman in the superb and inspiring attempt in applying the federative principle on a world scale to bring about a better system and a firmer foundation for international law and morality. The doctrine of sovereignty was never carried so far as by the Prussian State; it defeated its own end.

" VII.

"The draft approved by the conference at Versailles for the constitution of a league of nations embodies the best attainable in the present condition of opinion.

"1. It provides for a permanent organization always ready to function.

"2. It makes provision for a taboo or 'outlawry' of any nation refusing to abide its decision.

"3. It furnishes machinery for solving one of the world's fundamental difficulties—to wit, the exploitation of undeveloped peoples.

"4. The difference between the proposed plan and the mere opportunity for arbitration afforded by The Hague Conference is, of course, fundamental. The latter assists the established practices of arbitration and aims at some codification of international law, while the proposed league institutes a new world order designed to correct the inherent disruptive tendencies inevitable in the system of theoretical, sovereign, independent, unrelated nations.

"5. Above all, it places preponderant power in the hands of the world's great democracies and gives to France, the United States, Great Britain, and Italy an influence which can always be decisive against predatory power under whatever forms disguised. The agreed plan marks a capital event in history and furnishes a basis for infinite development toward international cooperation and the marshaling of material and moral force behind law. World opinion is at last given an organ of expression. The part of America in bringing about this result is one for just patriotic congratulation.

"6. The Monroe doctrine announced to the world that the United States would protect the integrity of South American States against foreign aggression. The league extends that principle of protection to all nations. The rights of the United States are not impaired; the guaranties of the States of South America are strengthened. It is a misapprehension of the meaning of the Monroe doctrine to believe it endangered by the proposed plan.

"President Monroe defined his own doctrine as follows:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those (European) powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of suppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

"One of the latest official exponents of the doctrine, President Theodore Roosevelt, so defined it:

"The Monroe doctrine should be the cardinal feature of the foreign policy of all the nations in the two Americas, as it is of the United States. * * * The Monroe doctrine is a declaration that there must be no territorial aggrandizement by any non-American power at the expense of any American power on American soil. It is in no wise intended as hostile to any nation in the Old World. Still less is it intended to give cover to any aggression by one New World power at the expense of any other. It is simply a step, and a long step, toward assuring the universal peace of the world by securing the possibility of permanent peace on this hemisphere. During the past century other influences have established the permanence and the independence of the smaller States of Europe. Through the Monroe doctrine we hope to be able to safeguard like independence and secure like permanence for the lesser among the New World nations.

"I know of no more completely adequate or satisfactory definition.

"Senator Root has lucidly defined the now traditional doctrine, as follows:

"It is the substance of the thing to which the Nation holds, and that is and always has been, that the safety of the United States demands that American territory shall remain American.

"The Monroe doctrine does not assert or imply or involve any right on the part of the United States to impair or control the independent sovereignty of any American State. The declaration of Monroe was that the rights and interests of the United States were involved in maintaining a condition, and the condition to be maintained was the independence of all the American countries. * * * We frequently see statements that the doctrine has been changed or enlarged; that there is a new or different doctrine since Monroe's time. They are mistaken. There has been no change. One apparent extension of the statement of Monroe was made by President Polk. * * * All assertions to the contrary notwithstanding, there has been no other change or enlargement of Monroe's doctrine since it was first promulgated.

"7. Those who oppose a league in principle are, in large part, the men who obstructed America's entrance into the World War on the theory of 'isolation' or unconcern with the affairs of other nations; a theory never true to the facts and absurd in this century, in which nothing is so impossible to conceive as a lotus-eating America 'careless of mankind.' The experience of the Great War has killed the theory, save in the most parochial-minded. This is no time for 'little Americans.'

"8. On the other hand, there are those in and out of the Senate who, while honestly favoring a league of nations, attack the proposed plan upon the ground that it would require the sending of American troops to take part in Europe's struggles. While this appears to us a parochial view overlooking changed world conditions, which necessitate action on the part of America to maintain peace in a world which modern methods of transportation have made comparatively small, we think that an extension of the very valuable plan of mandatory control would meet the objection, as far as it has any foundation, by dividing the world into four zones, one of which would be the Western Hemisphere, in which the United States, acting in accordance with the league's mandate, could intervene when anarchic or other conditions threatened world peace. The United States, as in the case of the Philippines, has never hesitated in its willingness to give an account of its political stewardship.

"9. Inaction would be fatal. Some means to solve pending problems must be found. The mass of mankind ardently desires something that may save civilization from war or anarchy. Leaders of opinion can not be dumb to the clamor of world

anguish. The present proposed constitution of a league of nations, with slight modifications not inconsistent with its announced principles and with a revision clarifying some of its clauses, would be the greatest advance yet made by mankind on the long, cruel road from the reign of force and fraud toward that of law and peace."

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for amendments only.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I think I ought to say that the only changes in the former bill are to one part of one section. One change simply strikes out \$6,000,000 and inserts \$8,000,000, on page 43, and the other change strikes out, on the same page, the item in which the original members of the Federal Board were included with others in the limitation of salaries. Those are the only two changes that occur in the bill as it was originally passed through both bodies.

I have been asked a number of questions regarding the amounts made available for the vocational educational problem altogether. I desire to say that to this \$8,000,000 may be added the \$6,000,000 passed in the special bill which came from the Committee on Education and Labor. There was also \$3,500,000, or a little more, for the current year provided for in the original bill and its amendments providing for the educational rehabilitation problem, and there is \$5,500,000 in the Army bill. So the whole amount passed at this time and available for the current year is \$23,000,000.

The veto of the President was based upon something like 4,000 soldiers now under care of this agency and 4,000 more who will have to be taken on, and he asked for an addition of \$2,000,000. The House has provided even more than that—\$14,000,000 more, carried in the two bills.

As to the limitation of salaries, I have here a list of the changes that have been made. Several Members of the House have told me that the Vocational Board is entirely satisfied with the list as finally arranged, and that will be shown by reading the printed report of the hearings. While it provides very liberally for 288 in place of 307, starting at \$6,000 and the lowest man getting \$2,500, yet there is saved in this list \$94,080. The 288 men will get from \$2,500 to \$6,000 and there is no limit as to how many they may employ under \$2,500 per annum.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I did not quite understand the Senator. Do I understand his position to be that there is no limitation upon the amount that may be utilized of this appropriation for the payment of employees and no limit upon the number of employees?

Mr. WARREN. The limit is as I stated. The balance of it is, of course, subject to the judgment and determination of the board as to how many, if any, they shall employ. They have at present employed, as I understand it and as the evidence seems to show, 307, but they felt that they could cut that number to 288.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is very difficult to hear what the Senator says, and I am very much interested in his statement.

Mr. WARREN. I was saying that they have employed 307 men, whose total salaries amount to \$941,580. The list was gone over at the hearings and the secretary of the board has assured me that this schedule of 288 men has been accepted by the board as satisfactory. All the 288 men receive salaries of \$2,500 or more, and the necessary employment of additional men can be made at figures less than \$2,500 each.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee decided that they would offer no amendment to the bill, and the bill as now reported is the bill as it passed the House. I want to take just a short time of the Senate to discuss some features of the bill, particularly the appropriation that has been referred to by the chairman of the committee.

The chairman is correct in saying that there has been appropriated with the amount carried in the pending bill \$23,000,000 to cover all the activities of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, both in the direct appropriation for that board and the appropriation through the Army appropriation bill. I want to say in the beginning that this \$23,000,000 is not going to be sufficient to pay the expenses that will be incurred the coming year. We might just as well know it now as later in the year.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator right there what his estimate of the deficiency will be?

Mr. SMOOT. The estimate by the officials of the bureau is that there will be \$11,000,000 deficiency.

Mr. THOMAS. I suppose it is safe to assume it will be a good deal more than that.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no doubt at all in my mind but what it will be.

So far as the object of the legislation is concerned, nobody can find fault with it. If the money was to be expended in a way that no criticism could be offered of it, and if it were expended primarily for the soldier himself, I doubt whether a soul would utter a word of objection. But if the reports are true that come to me, Mr. President, this bill is not altogether a bill for the rehabilitation of soldiers. It is also a bill intended to rehabilitate superannuated professors and school-teachers from one end of the country to the other. The proposed organization on July 1, 1919, was as the chairman of the committee said—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator mean that they are to be rehabilitated financially under the terms of the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what I mean.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will pardon me, if he means that incompetent, broken-down teachers are to be employed at good salaries, I think the Senator is mistaken about it.

Mr. SMOOT. If I am informed correctly, a great many of these teachers are now here in the District of Columbia awaiting the passage of the bill, and if I am informed correctly there have been letters sent to all the States of the Union asking for a list of teachers that they can get who are not employed at this time, who could be used in this service. I have not seen those letters, but I am told by a man who has been interested in this legislation that that is the case, and that they have a great number of them in the District of Columbia now waiting to be employed as soon as the President signs this bill.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator who sent the letters?

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator would know just as much about who sent them out as I would.

Mr. KENYON. Would it be Dr. Prosser?

Mr. SMOOT. I can not say whether he signed the letters or not, but the Senator knows himself that there have been letters sent throughout the country asking for such information.

Mr. KENYON. I heard the Senator from Utah say that, and he is generally correct, and, of course, I would be inclined to accept his statement at this time, but I would like to bring out who is accused of doing that and find out about it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not seen the letters, but I have been told they were sent out by a man who has been interested in the advancement of this legislation.

Mr. President, it is true that in the organization as proposed on July 1, 1919, there were to be 307 employees receiving salaries all the way from \$2,500 to \$10,000. I have the list showing the number of employees comprising the 307 and the compensation to be paid to each grade.

The committee in the House took this question up and agreed, as I am informed, with the officials of the bureau to a reorganization as reported in this bill, and the number receiving above \$2,500 has been cut from 307 to 288. There is no limit in this bill as to the number of teachers who can be employed at \$2,475—

Mr. THOMAS. Or \$2,499?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, or \$2,499, as the Senator suggests. The sky is the only limit. Of all the legislative bills that have been presented to Congress that open the door wide to pay any salary below \$2,500 out of a lump-sum appropriation, this bill and its companions are the limit. There is no particular amount named that shall be paid for salaries. It can all be paid for salaries under this appropriation. No amount is set aside for the expenses. All is to be paid out of one lump sum, to be handled exactly in the way that the officials of the bureau may desire. Prof. Branch, of Chicago, Ill., the head of the Branch School of Engineers at Chicago, was in Washington when this bill was under consideration before. Prof. Branch was one of the men at the first meeting in Washington at the time Dr. Prosser arranged for the meeting of certain professors throughout the country for the purpose of proposing this legislation.

Prof. Branch tells me that at that meeting the program was mapped out and certain schools of the country selected where this education should take place, and it was agreed at that meeting, he informs me, that the schools should receive their proportion of the soldiers based upon their ability to handle

them or the room that they might have to accommodate them. The professor came to Washington a short time ago, protesting against the agreement not being carried out. I asked him in what way, and he said that the Branch School of Engineers, of Chicago, Ill., up to that time had not had one soldier assigned to it; and, on the other hand, Dr. Prosser assigned to the school in which he was interested, namely, the Dunwoody Institute, in Minnesota, nearly 4,000 soldiers.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Did Prof. Branch make that statement to the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; he made that statement to me.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I have very little confidence in anything that he says.

Mr. SMOOT. Prof. Branch told me that he had offered to take students at \$15 per month and that Dr. Prosser was charging \$50 a month for every soldier.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator is sure of his facts it is a very serious charge. I had heard those charges around the Capitol—

Mr. SMOOT. I asked Prof. Branch to go to see you at 9.30 o'clock one morning and tell his story to you.

Mr. KENYON. He did spend an hour and a half with me, and then I followed the story up, because it was a shocking thing to me that such a thing should go on. Does the Senator understand that Dr. Prosser, on this statement of Mr. Branch or any other information the Senator has, had these men in the Dunwoody Institute after he became connected with the Vocational Board?

Mr. SMOOT. Prof. Branch did not tell me what time they began assigning to his school, and therefore I can not say. I am not going to say anything except just what Prof. Branch told me.

Mr. KENYON. I know, but these are pretty serious charges against a man like Dr. Prosser, and if they are true, Dr. Prosser ought to go.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. As I understand the facts, if the Senator will allow me to state them—

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; I shall be glad to have the Senator state them.

Mr. KENYON. Before Dr. Prosser became a member of the board at all there were some 4,000 soldiers who had been sent to the Dunwoody Institute at different times for training—that is, for different kinds of positions with the Army. That was done by that institution, which is an endowed institution in Minnesota. Since that time and up to the present time I have a list of men who are at the Dunwoody Institute. The Senator from Georgia has one. At this time there are 44, and there is no such charge as \$50 a month made. The Senator from Georgia and myself, who do not stand for graft any more than anybody else, called these men and talked to them. I had heard of the Bliss Institute having received \$50 a month for tuition, which seemed to me to be an outrageous proposition. I have not yet substantiated that, but the contracts were made to pay for these soldiers' training on the basis of just what the institution charges others. The Senator, I am sure, is mistaken. I know the Senator is so fair that he would not want to make a charge against a man holding the important public position that Dr. Prosser does, with a clean life and character, reflecting upon him as it does, if it is not true.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly. The Senator knows me well enough to be sure of the fact I would not do that.

Mr. KENYON. I do. Upon what does the Senator base his statement that \$50 a month was paid in this Dunwoody Institute?

Mr. SMOOT. I said Prof. Branch told me, and I think he told the Senator, too. If he did not, he did not tell him all he told me. He said that there was \$50 a month charged in the Dunwoody Institute for every man who was sent to that institution. He also said that he had offered, and was ready, to take the same men or the same number of men into his institution for \$15 a month.

Mr. KENYON. He did, and I think Mr. Branch ought to have some of these men. I do not like the situation in that respect. But he did not know that the \$50 a month was charged. It is just like all these other rumors that float around, distorting people's characters. When I pinned him down to whether or not he knew, he said that he did not know, and I say it is not true.

Mr. SMOOT. He stated to me that he did know it, and he said they were getting \$50 a month.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Again he discredited himself by putting himself in the attitude of a man who states one thing that is absolutely false and is not to be believed in anything he says.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state my object in speaking about the matter. I do not want this board to start out with any such proposition as one of the men who was instrumental in providing for this very legislation said that it started with. I would not say a word to blacken the character of a single soul on earth; I know what false reports mean to men; but here was a man who attended the very first meeting, who was asked to attend that meeting here in Washington, and did so, and the program was mapped out, the policy was adopted of selecting where the soldiers should be sent, and every detail was agreed to beforehand, before they came to Congress to ask for this legislation.

If Prof. Branch has made statements such as I say he has, and I am quite sure the Senator from Iowa feels positive that he made the statements to me, he should not have a soldier sent to his institute if the statements are untrue.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator pardon me?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. I do not want to see the Senator do any injustice to his informant. I think if we had taken him and pinned him right down to whether he knew this to be true, he would have stated that he did not, but he had heard it, as the Senator has heard it.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator is wrong there, because I stood in the Senate hallway and listened to him, and I asked him to go to Mr. Goop, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and tell him the story he had told me, as the question was then to come before the Senate in the sundry civil appropriation bill, the bill that finally passed Congress on the 1st day of July. I asked him, "Am I at liberty to use this information?" He said, "Yes." And not only that, but he expressed an earnest desire that hearings should be had, and stated that he was perfectly willing to appear before a committee of the Senate and testify to these things.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, that raises a straight question of veracity. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. So am I. Why not bring this man before the committee, and bring Dr. Prosser before the committee? This is a question of fact that is susceptible of proof. The information furnished me by the board is as follows:

Tuition for regular courses is free to residents of Minnesota.

Entrance fee, \$3.

When necessary to arrange a special course for a man or group of men because of their peculiar handicap or lack of previous preparation, 50 cents per day may be paid until such time as a man is qualified to enter upon a regular course offered by the institute.

Tuition rate for men outside the State varies from \$15 to \$20 per month, depending wholly on course.

If Mr. Branch is going around stating that Mr. Prosser is placing men in an institution with which he has been connected, and with which he has a nominal connection now, at \$50 a month tuition, that is a mighty serious charge.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what it is.

Mr. KENYON. And if it is true, I should say that the President of the United States, if he can, ought to request Mr. Prosser to resign. If it is not true, then the gentleman who makes these accusations ought to come here or before a committee and say that he has been mistaken.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as I said before, I think that if Mr. Branch has made these statements, and they are not true, his institution should not be used in any way for the rehabilitation of our soldiers. I will go that far.

Mr. KENYON. If Mr. Branch makes the charges, let him come in and prove them, and "prove up or shut up" when he is assailing the character of a man like Dr. Prosser.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator from Iowa is right. But, Mr. President, we can not wait for the passage of this bill upon that account. That can be done hereafter.

Mr. KENYON. I want to ask the Senator if he really believes now in his heart that these men were sent to the Dunwoody Institute when there are only 44 of them now, instead of 4,000? There have not been 5,200 in training at any time; so it is a perfectly ridiculous statement that 4,000 of them were receiving this training at Dunwoody Institute. Does he really believe that these men have been sent up there, and have paid \$50 a month?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, after what the Senator from Iowa has stated, I have my grave doubts of it; and I want the Senator from Iowa to understand that I have never yet made a statement in this connection based on my own knowledge. I took particular pains to say to the Senate that I was telling the Senate just what Prof. Branch had told me, and I was very anxious that he should tell Mr. Goop, of the House, and Mr. KENYON, of the Senate, just what he told me.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I want to say that I was very much impressed with his appearance and candor and intellectuality, and what he said about his school; and I am satisfied now that what he meant to convey to the Senator and to me was that he had heard that this had been done, but that he was in no sense stating it as a fact.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that he told me this: He said, "It is nothing more or less than paying \$35 a month more to Dr. Prosser's institution than all the other institutions in this country would charge." If that is not a positive statement of what was being done, I do not know what could be. I shall be delighted to learn that it is not true, and I do not say that it is true, nor do I claim that it is true; but I do claim that that is what Prof. Branch told me in relation to this matter.

Now, Mr. President, I want the Congress to understand and the people of this country to understand that there will be many, many a scheme and many a steal inaugurated in the name of the American soldier.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, why does the Senator put that in the future? It is being done now, it has been done ever since the armistice, and it will continue to be done as long as a single soldier of the American Expeditionary Forces is on this earth.

Mr. SMOOT. I accept the correction, because the Senator from Colorado is correct. Every faddist in the United States, every schemer who can think of some kind of a proposition to get dollars out of the Treasury of the United States, is trying to bolster it up by the statement that it is for the benefit of the American soldier who fought the battles of our country in a foreign land. Nobody lives who would do more than I to take care of the soldier. In my opinion nobody would object to an appropriation for his relief; but I have seen so many schemes started with the evident purpose of helping the man that starts them, based upon a statement that it was for the recognition of the service of the soldiers of our country, that I am getting suspicious of claims coming under that guise or disguise.

I am not going to object to this appropriation; but I want to say, as I said in the beginning, that this appropriation is not going to be sufficient to carry on the work for the coming year. If the work is carried on with no graft attached to it, in the spirit in which Congress acts in making the appropriation, there is not an American citizen that would object to it.

I doubt whether it would be wise now to send this bill back to the House. I doubt whether it would be wisdom to undertake at this time to make an appropriation for the personnel of the bureau, as is done in the case of nearly all of the different departments of the Government, but if there were time to do so it would be the very height of wisdom, and then make certain appropriations for certain purposes, and then, when reports come to Congress, find out just how the money was expended. The trouble is with these lump-sum appropriations. When we find that there are being paid by the Government, at some of these bureaus, salaries as high as \$15,000 out of a lump sum, with no report made to Congress, we ought to stop it.

I say now, Mr. President, as I said before, that we are not going to reduce the number of Government employees in the District of Columbia until the Appropriations Committee refuses to give the money. That is the only way in which it will be done. Why, do you realize that in the Civil Service Commission's report that I picked up just this morning I find that there were added to the employees in the District of Columbia from June 1 to June 28 four thousand five hundred and odd employees, and during that same time there were separated from the service 3,381 employees, or an increase of 1,119 in the number of employees in the District of Columbia from June 1 to June 28 of this year? We all thought that just as soon as the war was over some of these departments, at least, would begin to reduce their forces.

I know it is too late to do anything with the appropriations for the present fiscal year; but I want to say that I shall object to any further appropriation bills passing this body unless there is some authority that will show why the appropriations should be made. Unless there is a reduction in the number of employees in the District, I for one shall insist that the appropriations be cut, irrespective of what the department officials say.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Is any investigation being made by any of the committees for the purpose of ascertaining the character of services rendered by the employees, and the necessity for a reduction, or the reason why a reduction is not being made in the clerical forces of the Government in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SMOOT. None that I know of.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator pardon me while I call attention to a card which I have recently received? I have had perhaps 50 similar letters and cards from employees in the Government service. I received this one on the 10th of the present month from a relative of one of the employees in a Government department. A portion of the card is as follows:

The person referred to worked her first day in the War Department, Nineteenth and B NW., and filed 900—

Then there is a blank space, meaning, I suppose, papers—expecting to do better the next day. Before the close of the first day several of the young men working there in the same department took her aside and told her to lay off working that way, as she would work several of them out of a job. Since then she has only filed 400 per day. You should pension these young men. It would save office rent.

This is one of the letters or cards of the same character, which I think many of the Senators are receiving, showing the incompetent service which is being rendered, and showing that in many of the departments there are people hanging on, doing nothing, and preventing those who have an inclination to do an honest day's work from performing their service. Something ought to be done to rid these departments of the thousands of incompetent, inefficient, and unnecessary employees.

Mr. SMOOT. If our Efficiency Bureau had the power given them to go into all the departments without the consent of the heads of the departments, and then had power to put their recommendations into force, I have not any doubt but that we could get rid of a third of the employees in the District of Columbia. I receive letters every day from the employees of the departments. I received one this morning. I am not going to read it. It is a long one, but, among other things, it said in the letter:

Employees in different divisions all told the same story, that they had nothing to do for days at a time, and that their supervisors came to them and told them to write letters to their friends, or do anything to keep up the appearance of being busy.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate to read the whole letter, but I do claim that we are not going to separate the employees in the District of Columbia from the Government service as long as we appropriate money to pay them.

Mr. President, I have said what I have for the very purpose of bringing this matter to the attention of the board itself; I want to say frankly to the Senator from Iowa that after what has been said, and the statements that have been made, even were they true, I do not believe the board would now continue such actions in the future. I hope and trust that there is nothing in the reports; but I considered it of enough importance to bring to the attention of Congress, so that if there was any truth whatever in the reports the board would see that that condition was corrected and rectified; and that, I have confidence, will be done.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield the floor.

Mr. KENYON. I rose to ask a question, but I can say what I had in mind in just a minute. It is in reply to the question raised by the Senator from Utah.

I am generally in such thorough accord with the Senator from Utah on these propositions of dispensing with the services of unnecessary clerks, and all these matters, that I do not like to disagree with him now. I do not think we disagree on anything except what are the facts. If they are the facts as the Senator states them, I can agree with him.

I want to say about this proposition of rehabilitation professors that the Senator speaks of, and that they have sent out through the country letters to bring all of the professors here or to different places and put them on the pay roll, that the facts of that matter are just these: When they saw the tremendous amount of work they were to have under this larger number of soldiers they did ask then for the months of July and August—that was the limit of the employment—to register at their different offices around the country professors who could be used for this particular work. I will say to the Senator that it was merely a temporary employment. That is all there is to that story of bringing in all the professors and school-teachers in this country for rehabilitation work; and they did not get anybody.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. KING. I should like to state to the Senator that I have received communications from a number of professors and executive officers in institutions of learning throughout the United States, who state that they would be very glad to

operate within their own States and discharge any duty that this board may require that they should perform within their States, for nothing. They want to make contribution toward the work of rehabilitating the soldier, and they would be only too glad to aid in every possible way in their own States without charging anything whatever.

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator that especially in New York and New Jersey has that been true. There have been a great many dollar-a-year men helping in this work.

Mr. KING. Oh, if the Senator will pardon me, many of the State universities and State schools will care for some of these soldiers who are to be rehabilitated; and the universities and colleges within the States and other schools within the States will be very glad to aid and will not charge anything for their services. The difficulty has been, or rather the reason why more have not offered their services, that the idea has gone out that Dr. Prosser and those associated with him were building up a great Federal machine here, and they were paying high salaries, and they did not want anybody within the States who would not separate themselves entirely from their State activities and give their undivided time and attention to the Government and come here and be under the direction of Dr. Prosser and his assistants, so that they could be sent throughout the country on a sort of ambulatory mission. I am sure that if they would utilize in the States the services of the educational men within the States they would get a far better service than they will get now and it would not cost the Government as much as the present plan will cost.

Mr. KENYON. They have been doing that. All I want to do further is to place in the RECORD a copy of a letter from Dr. Prosser to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] explaining the Dunwoody Institute matter. I think it will clear up the entire matter; and I think his other statement clears up the professorship matter that we have heard so much about.

I am in agreement with the Senator, however, that there are probably too many employees; and I wish there were some way in all of those departments in which the number of employees could be cut down. I will join the Senator in any kind of a move in that direction.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be placed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

JULY 3, 1919.

Hon. MEDILL MCCORMICK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCORMICK: Having been honored with a call from your secretary, Mr. Hansen, wanting certain facts, it gives me pleasure to furnish you the following information as to the training of disabled soldiers by the Federal Board for Vocational Education at Dunwoody Institute, Minneapolis, and in Chicago, Ill.

When the war broke, I was director at Dunwoody, coming to Washington on leave of absence to become director of the Federal Board for Vocational Education under the vocational educational law approved February 23, 1917. By the vocational rehabilitation act, approved June 27, 1918, the reeducation and placement in employment of disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines was also given to the board, and I have been responsible, as director, for this new work as well. I expect at an early date to return to Dunwoody.

The Federal board is using more than 500 institutions in this country for the training of disabled men in agriculture, commerce, and the trades and industries, as well as shops, offices, and farms. A list of these institutions as of June 1 is given on pages 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Vocational Summary for May, 1919, attached hereto.

These institutions are approved before being used by the central office on the recommendation of the superintendent of training and the chief of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Information is gathered about the school. A personal inspection is also made by some representative of the board. Practically all the proposals to use a school are made by the district vocational officer for the district in which the school is located, and approved unless there is reason for disapproval by the central office. All the proposals for the use of schools in the Chicago and Minneapolis districts have been made by the district offices.

Eighteen schools and plants are being used by the Minneapolis district, as shown on pages 3 and 5 of the Vocational Summary attached, the disabled men sent them from the States of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and Montana. The training work for each district is carried on largely in the district office city where the work can be carefully supervised by the agents of the board.

Dunwoody is one of these 18 schools recommended by the district office and approved by this office. It is a private philanthropic institution giving training for about 20 different trades and industries and has an equipment in plants and buildings worth about \$1,000,000 and an endowment of more than \$5,000,000. It admits all disabled Minnesota men to regular classes free of charge and charges only actual cost for special classes. Since it can not, under the terms of the will of the founder, admit nonresidents of the State free of charge, the actual cost of their instruction is paid.

The records of this office show the following facts regarding the number of disabled men in training at Dunwoody on July 1, 1919:

Number of men in regular courses at Dunwoody Institute to date..... 41
(Of this number, 7 have discontinued the course.)
Number of men taking electrical courses..... 7
(These are included in the number given on the second line.)

LIST BY COURSES.

Baking.....	3
Electrical work related to telephone industry.....	3
Electrical courses.....	4
Machine shop.....	7
Tractors and gas engines.....	3
Tractor repair and operation.....	5
Linotype.....	1
Commercial photography.....	1
Farm mechanics.....	1
Oxyacetylene welding.....	2
Auto mechanics.....	5
Building construction.....	2
Printing.....	1
Building construction and drafting.....	1

Total..... 41
Number of receiving-station cases..... 69

SUMMARY OF MEN AT DUNWOODY.

Regular courses.....	41
Receiving-station courses.....	69

Total..... 110

Included in the above are:	
Regular electric courses.....	7
Receiving-station courses in electrical lines.....	18

Total..... 35

The whole matter of the use of this school was frankly discussed with the standing committee of the board at the start, as I anticipated that some person with a grievance, real or imaginary, would raise the question sooner or later. It was necessary for us to use the school, since it is the only industrial and trade school with proper facilities for this task in the four States of the district. We could not punish the disabled man because the director had been connected with it.

I am informed that Mr. Branch, president of an electrical school at Chicago, has charged that, using my official position here to the advantage of Dunwoody, more than 4,000 disabled soldiers have been trained there. Surely this is a mistake, as the total number of men who have been placed in training from the start of the work in 48 States and 500 institutions was approximately 4,200 up to July 1, 1919. As I pointed out above, 110 of these are in training at Dunwoody, of whom 4 have been awarded courses in electricity.

In this connection it may be interesting to show the numbers of disabled men in training in other institutions for the trades and industries:

Ohio Mechanics Institute, Cincinnati.....	131
Tulane, New Orleans.....	110
Franklin, Boston.....	70
Georgia Tech, Atlanta.....	89
Dunwoody, Minneapolis.....	110
Rankin, St. Louis.....	52

It is possible that Mr. Branch has reference to the training done by Dunwoody during the war of enlisted or drafted soldiers preparing for mechanical and technical positions in the Army and Navy. These were not disabled men, but soldiers preparing for service across seas, sent to the institute by the War or Navy Departments for training under the same contract made with at least a hundred other similar institutions in the country. Dunwoody trained upward of 8,000 men for mechanical and technical service in Army or Navy, of whom about half were for each service.

The first arrangements were made with the Navy by me in June, 1917, while I was still at the school. From June until January, 1917, the institute paid from its own funds as a patriotic contribution about \$100,000 for the instruction of sailors and marines barracked for the purpose at Minneapolis, for which it has not and does not expect to receive a cent of reimbursement from the Government. Beginning January 1 all detachments of sailors and marines were trained at Dunwoody at a price less than actual cost.

When the committee on education and special training began its work of training mechanics and technicians for the military service, Dunwoody was one of the schools approved by the War Department committee. Its dealings were entirely with Mr. H. W. Kavel, the acting director of Dunwoody, and contracts were made by him with the committee directly. I might say, in passing, that in carrying out these contracts the school lost not less than \$50,000 in addition, which it regards as a patriotic contribution.

The necessity for the use of schools for this purpose was urged in every possible way by the Federal board on the Secretary of War, and a general plan for it prescribed to him, which was adopted as a basis for the work of the committee on education and special training.

At the outset the plan was for the Federal board to have charge of the inspection and supervision of the training under the committee. At the very outset, however, serious differences of opinion about policies and procedure caused the withdrawal of the Federal board with entire good will from the work of the War Department committee before any soldiers had been sent to an institution for training. At the request of the committee the Federal board detailed some of its agents to inspect about 40 institutions, one of which was Dunwoody, and report their findings to the committee. This represents the total connection of the board and, therefore, of myself with this matter.

Mr. Branch was very active and very much interested in this matter when a conference was held by the board here in Washington with heads of institutions from all over the country to learn whether the plans proposed by the board to the Secretary of War were feasible. Inasmuch as we had nothing to do with the approval of schools and severed our connection with the committee within a month after the plan was launched, I have had no general knowledge, in a busy life, as to which schools were used, nor have I known whether or not Mr. Branch's school was used.

Now as to the facts regarding the use of Chicago and Illinois schools for disabled men. A glance at page 2 of the attached vocational summary will show these schools as recommended for use by Mr. Sylvester, the district officer at Chicago, and approved by this office. The total number of men in training in the city of Chicago on July 1 was 241. Inasmuch as Mr. Branch's school is an electrical school, you will doubtless be interested in knowing that only four disabled men are training there for electricians and for electrical engineering, as follows: Armour Institute, 1; Commercial School of Trades, 1; Lewis Institute, 1; Lane Technology, 1.

Mr. Hamilton, the superintendent of training at this office, who has charge of the approval of schools, is absent from the city. When he

returns I shall ask him to provide for you a statement as to his decision concerning Mr. Branch's school and the reason therefor.

May I not assure you in closing that so far as I know no person connected with this board is in any way prejudiced against either Mr. Branch or his school. Personally my relations with him have always been cordial and friendly. As we can not, however, place students in every institution, we must make a decision as between institutions in the exercise of our duty and responsibility to disabled men. You are at liberty to use this letter in any way you see fit.

Very truly, yours,

Director.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Iowa, in all fairness to Prof. Branch, that it was not he that told me of the letters that were sent broadcast throughout the country asking for professors who could enter this service. That came to me from a man who is here in the District, and, as I am informed, knew of all the letters that were being sent out.

Mr. KENYON. But has the Senator any of those letters? I have asked the Board for Vocational Training to send me some of those letters, so that I might put them in the RECORD. Their statement, made to me not over 10 minutes ago, is that they are merely temporary matters, lasting only for the months of July and August, when they supposed that this work would be at its height.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I have not the letters, as I stated in the beginning, and yesterday morning was the first I had heard of them; and, as I say to the Senator, the information came to me from a party who said that he knew of the letters and called my attention to them.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am very much gratified that the President vetoed this bill and gave us an opportunity to right what I think was a serious wrong in the bill as it was passed, so far as it treated the question of giving a chance for rehabilitation by vocational training to wounded or injured soldiers. There were severely wounded, according to the records, about 80,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there for just a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is due Congressman Goop to make this statement:

Congressman Goop and I met Dr. Prosser and two other of his associates in the Marble Room when the former bill was under consideration, and I heard Congressman Goop say to Dr. Prosser that with the amount of money that they had on hand, and the statement that was made by him that they had sufficient to pay the July expenses, he thought that the \$6,000,000 provided in the other bill was sufficient; but if it was not sufficient, he would promise Dr. Prosser that, as far as he was concerned as chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, he would see that the money was furnished in due time.

I wanted to say that, because I am quite sure that Mr. Goop felt, just as I felt, that the bill was satisfactory to Dr. Prosser in the way that it was originally passed, with that understanding; but afterwards the question of the limitation of salaries came up, and now, as I understand, that is the reason why objection was made to it more than the amount appropriated. I think the Senator from Georgia knows that if the appropriation made was not sufficient it would have been taken care of.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understood perfectly when the bill was in the Senate that the appropriation which it carried was not sufficient to do the work. The Senate committee, however, had stricken out altogether the limitation placed by the House committee upon the salaries to be paid. At that time I called the attention of the Senate to a letter I had received from the Secretary of Commerce, with a suggested plan for a limitation of salaries substantially higher than those in the House bill; but as the Senate committee had stricken out entirely the provision with reference to the limitation of salaries, and as it provided enough to go on at present, I made no objection to the Senate bill, although I stated at the time that, of course, it did not carry enough money for the work, but it would do until further legislation might be passed. The radical defect was that when we went to conference the House provision limiting salaries was restored, and with that provision nearly one-half of the force of instructors and experts necessarily would have resigned—a force that, in my opinion, was doing splendid work.

Mr. President, as I have just stated, there were, in round numbers, 80,000 soldiers reported severely wounded and total casualties of something like 240,000.

I believe it the duty—and it should be the pleasure—of those of us who did not go to the front, who stayed at home, safe and sound, to tax ourselves enough to make these men who have lost their arms and lost their legs and been otherwise physically injured financially whole so far as we can possibly do so. I believe that in the case of the man who has lost his leg or his arm and who was making \$150 a month or \$200 a

month before we ought to be glad to pay him all his financial loss. I never have been much in favor of service pensions. If the man gets out sound, I think he ought to receive his compensation in connection with his discharge; but whether he volunteered to go to the front, or whether by draft we sent him to the front, he did the fighting for those of us who were here at home. We should find real pleasure to make up to the injured his loss of earning capacity caused by his injury. I feel that these 243,000 men ought to receive from us willingly a sum which will put them where they can live or earn or be compensated by their Government to the extent of their financial loss as a result of their injury.

The railroad company is liable to its employee who is injured in its service to the extent of his injury. I do not say there is a legal liability on the Government, but I say there is a moral liability, and it ought to be a pleasure to follow the policy of making these injured men financially sound.

Mr. President, accepting that as a basis for my discussion of this subject, I come to the question of the effort by the Government, through the expenditure of money, to fit these injured men again to take their place in labor, in occupations—not perhaps the old place, perhaps a new one—but to fit them, so far as college instruction or other instruction can do so, to take a place where they can again make what they made before their injuries were received.

It was with that in view that I had the pleasure of presenting to the Senate at the Sixty-fifth Congress a bill to provide vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled soldiers and sailors discharged from the military and naval forces of the United States. The Senate of the United States, after a three-day debate, on a roll call, had no Senator who failed to support the bill. It was unanimously passed. Why, it was not only right, it was sound economically. It was sound economically because if we spend two or three thousand dollars a man to fit him to return to occupation so that he can earn as much as he did before, it is a much less sum than we would be called on to pay if we kept up his salary permanently. He perhaps was a man making \$1,500 to \$2,000 or from \$1,000 to \$2,000 a year. If he is left without special training, his earning capacity may be practically gone; but if we spend \$3,000 to fit him again to earn \$1,000 to \$2,000 a year it is an economic saving, according to my view of the responsibility of his Government for his loss. What is wrong with that? It is an economic saving to the country because we are fitting a man who otherwise might do nothing to be a producer and a substantial and useful citizen. Over and above that, we bring back into his life the joy of not being dependent upon charity, of not being dependent upon his Government to compensate him year by year for his loss. We bring back into his life the joy and privilege of doing for himself, of being still capable of earning for himself and perhaps for his wife and his children a support.

Mr. President, when I consider the problem of vocational rehabilitation, I can not be patient with suggestions of extreme, narrow economy. I do not believe anywhere that money should be wasted. But the experience of the countries involved in the war, even before we entered the war, demonstrated the fact that men with physical injuries, oftentimes unable to pursue their former occupation, by special training, by special instruction, have been fitted in many, many instances to again earn a competency even larger than that which they earned before. A fairly well-educated farm laborer loses his arm or his leg or is injured otherwise physically so that active physical labor can no longer be performed by him. He goes to the agricultural college, and in a two-year course is taught and becomes capable of doing a higher order of work than he ever did before and producing more than he did before. I mention this as one of many lines in which the physically defective may receive training which will fit him for profitable occupation.

Mr. President, to give such instruction, to give such aid to the injured soldiers is a splendid contribution upon the part of this country, a splendid use of money, lessening our real liability to them and adding greatly to their value as citizens and their opportunities for happy lives.

I think this work will cost a good deal of money. We have now 13,757 injured soldiers who have been approved for training by the central office. We have 5,200 now in training. We have 8,577 approved, who are going forward at once, and in a few days there will be 13,757 in training. One hundred and forty-seven thousand one hundred and nineteen have been reached by the representatives of the Federal board and have been informed of their rights; 98,779 are under supervision, and efforts are being made to classify and assign them. Suppose it costs \$1,400 or \$1,500 a year to give to one of these men his training and to fit him to go back into active occupation, we should not be disturbed about the cost.

The Canadian Government undertook to erect buildings and carry its injured soldiers into schools organized and built expressly for the purpose. A much wiser policy was embodied in our bill. It was the policy to distribute them to existing institutions, retaining them as near to their homes as practicable.

It has been charged that there was some arrangement looking toward the schools to which the soldiers would be distributed agreed upon before the rehabilitation bill was introduced, and the inference has been drawn that this was to aid favored institutions. I will state to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] what, if it is investigated, will be found to be the truth upon this subject. The question which confronted those of us studying the problem was, Shall we undertake to build schools as Canada did or can we find institutions already in existence prepared to do the work of training the injured soldiers?

A number of men not connected now with the Federal Board for Vocational Education, but educators and physicians, studied the work of a number of schools and colleges to see if the soldiers could be taken care of without establishing or building new institutions, not allotting the soldiers at the time to the schools, not distributing them then to any institutions, but to find out whether there were institutions already in existence that could meet with some added work the responsibility which was to be placed upon them if selected to train the injured soldiers. That is the whole of it, magnified and misrepresented into the statement that it was a scheme to give money to these particular institutions. The plan adopted was a wise one. I went over it with these men before I introduced the bill. I discussed it with teachers and college professors and men who were not connected with the Federal board to determine whether it was safe to provide in the bill that the money was not to be used to erect new institutions. That was the real object, but it is very easy to take a fact and repeat it once or twice and get a false impression about it. I am personally acquainted with the efforts that were made before I introduced the bill to find out whether institutions existed that could meet the demand.

With reference to the soldiers sent to the Dunwoody Institute in Minnesota by the Vocational Board, I do not think any considerable number are there. My memoranda does not show a hundred already placed in Dunwoody. I have a statement here of the manner in which they are paid. If they are from Minnesota and have no special instruction, as I understand it, the Minnesota students go to the school free of tuition; and most of those who are there are from Minnesota. If they have special instruction, that costs not to exceed 50 cents a day. I have a copy of the letter written by Dr. Prosser to the governor of the institute before scholars were assigned to it, stating that he could not consent to more than 50 cents a day being required as a basis, and \$20 a month was the limit. For students coming from other States, where the institute was not obliged to receive them, the Government was to pay tuition of from \$15 to \$20 a month, according to the character of the work and the expense put upon the institution in the matter of tuition.

The grand total is: Residents of Minnesota, 82; outsiders, 32; actually assigned, contracts pending, and contracts not yet received at the central office, July 13, 114 men for the Dunwoody Institute.

This shows how easy it is to misunderstand and misrepresent. It is hard to repeat a thing just as it is told you, even if you try to do so, and with a little feeling on the subject it is easy to magnify, and repetition transforms a situation from what it was into something which it never was.

I wish to say that I will be glad to join the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in calling for a list of every man employed in this work by the Vocational Board. I am deeply interested in this work. I am deeply interested in it for the good it will do, and then I am deeply interested in it because it is a measure I helped promote, and I wish to see it conducted absolutely clean, and I believe it will be. I wish every dollar that is expended spent solely for the good of the soldiers for whom it is to be used. I will join in this work the able chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, who succeeded me in that position last March. As he always helped me while I was chairman, I am determined to return the service, and help him as chairman in every way within my power.

Mr. KENYON. I thank the Senator. I hope I may be as the Senator was, for the Senator was always right, and I hope I may be as right as the Senator was and merit his aid.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Iowa and I agree on practically everything that has been done for several years past, and I think we were both right.

Mr. President, I hope this bill will pass as the House has sent it to us. I do not want Senators to be frightened by the

fact that this rehabilitation work will cost money. What I want them to do is to understand that if we rehabilitate these soldiers we will be meeting a liability that we ought otherwise to provide for year by year in appropriations far greater than any figures that the rehabilitation will cost.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President I offer the following notice in regard to the pending bill, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair). The Secretary will read the notice.

The Secretary read as follows:

Notice is hereby given that under Rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I shall to-morrow, July 19, 1919, or on the first legislative day after to-day when the Senate may be in session, move, when the bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, is before the Senate, to suspend subdivisions 2 and 3 of Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, prohibiting the adding of new items of appropriation and prohibiting the proposing of general legislation on any general appropriation bill, for the purpose of offering an amendment in the form of a new section to the said H. R. 7343 making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which said proposed amendment in the nature of a new section is as follows:

To resume and prosecute work on projects and units thereof under the reclamation act, stopped during the war, and to begin and prosecute existing projects and units thereof which are practically ready for prosecution, to be immediately available, and to be expended under the terms and conditions of the reclamation act, except that in the matter of employment a preference shall be given to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, \$50,000,000.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Amend, by adding after the figures "\$1,730,000," in line 21 of the bill, the following proviso:

Provided, That the status of peace between the former Imperial German Government and the United States of America being declared to exist, no part of said sum shall be used in enforcing the provisions of section 3 of the act of October 6, 1917, known as the trading-with-the-enemy act, as amended.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it does seem to me that this bill ought to be passed without adding anything to it. The chairman of the committee, of course, is in charge of the bill, and his judgment is better than mine. If we are to begin modifying other features of the bill it will be difficult to stop. This money is needed at once, is it not? Are we not running on it now?

Mr. WARREN. It should have been passed before the 1st day of July. We are running without the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We are running without funds since the 1st of July.

Mr. FALL. It is not my fault.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is not the Senator's fault, but it might be if we add such an amendment to the bill, however meritorious it may be.

Mr. FALL. I have not injected an amendment into the bill until this moment. I have taken up no time whatsoever in discussing it. I have been somewhat in sympathy with the Senator from Georgia, who has devoted a good deal of time when it was here before and now to discussing it. This is simply a limitation upon an appropriation. That is all it is.

Mr. KENYON. I understood, though I may be in error, it states that peace has been declared between Germany and the United States?

Mr. FALL. No; it is simply a recognition of the status as a reason for the limitation upon the pay of United States marshals.

Mr. KENYON. I am not going to object to it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	McCumber	Shields
Chamberlain	Harris	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Harrison	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Culberson	Henderson	Myers	Smith, Md.
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Smoot
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Spencer
Dillingham	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Stanley
Fall	Kellogg	Nugent	Sutherland
Fernald	Kenyon	Overman	Swanson
France	King	Page	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Pittman	Underwood
Gay	Knox	Polindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	La Follette	Randall	Walsh, Mont.
Hale	Lenroot	Reed	Warren

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPARD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on official business.

Mr. DIAL. I announce the absence of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] on account of illness in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am not out of sympathy with the object sought to be accomplished by the Senator from New Mexico, but I think it would be unfortunate to involve this bill, which ought to pass at once, with anything else. So I make the point of order that the amendment is general legislation offered on an appropriation bill; and, if the Chair will permit me, I will state the reason why I insist that it is general legislation.

The trading-with-the-enemy act fixed the time of the proclamation of the President as the time when peace shall be restored. The amendment proposes to substitute, I think, the declaration of Congress as the time of the termination of the war in place of the time fixed in the trading-with-the-enemy act.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia, possibly, is unaware of the fact that the trading-with-the-enemy act is permanent legislation that has been on the statute books of this country in one form or another since 1798, and during the present conditions the Congress of the United States in its wisdom saw fit to enact legislation along that line.

The trading-with-the-enemy act is itself permanent legislation which is invoked or coming in force automatically whenever this country is at war. The original act was placed upon our statute books during the status of war, which was never declared, between France and the United States of America. Section 3 of the trading-with-the-enemy act, which is the section referred to in the proposed amendment, simply makes it unlawful—

(a) For any person in the United States, except with the license of the President, granted to such person, or to the enemy, or ally of enemy, as provided in this act, to trade, or attempt to trade, * * *

That is permanent legislation which in one form or another we keep on our statute books, so that if war arises it is not necessary to reenact the legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let me ask the Senator, Is there a provision in the amendment limiting it to the termination of the war by the proclamation by the President?

Mr. FALL. There are other provisions of the act, such, for instance, as the provision with reference to the Alien Property Custodian, which, when the President declares the war to have ended, become inoperative.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. FALL. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Has this subject received consideration at the hands of the Foreign Relations Committee, of which the Senator is a member? If so, did not the committee act adversely upon the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. FALL. I made a statement in the Senate immediately after the action or nonaction—it was not action—by the Foreign Relations Committee, in which I stated that I had assurances that the resolution would be reported out within a day or two. At that time Germany had not yet signed the peace treaty. My understanding was that some Senators thought that the resolution to which the Senator from Utah refers should not be reported out until after Germany had signed the treaty, for the reason that otherwise I might be accused of giving encouragement to Germany not to sign the peace treaty. I have not brought the resolution up nor attempted to bring it up since.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit another inquiry?

Mr. FALL. Certainly.

Mr. KING. In view of the fact that the matter is still before the committee and has received consideration at its hands, and in view of the further fact that Germany has signed the treaty and the committee will undoubtedly act very promptly one way or the other upon the resolution, does not the Senator from New Mexico think it would be somewhat of a discourtesy for us now to take it out of the hands of the committee?

Mr. FALL. The Senator may possess a very much finer and keener sense of courtesy than has the Senator from New Mexico. If the Senator from New Mexico had entertained any such sentiment he would not have offered this amendment, because the Senator does not intend, however ignorantly he may act, to show any discourtesy to the Foreign Relations Committee, or any other committee, or any individual Senator, or to the Senate as a whole.

Mr. President, the status of affairs is simply this, and it might just as well be understood once for all: The status of peace between the United States and Germany exists, and are you afraid to declare it and turn your citizens loose and let them trade?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, does the Senator understand that the adoption of a resolution declaring that the United States is at peace with Germany would in any way control the status in Germany as viewed by the German Government?

Mr. FALL. No; I do not.

Mr. PITTMAN. Then we would be in a position where we had declared ourselves at peace with Germany, with no declaration on the part of Germany that she was at peace with the United States; would we not?

Mr. FALL. No; not at all.

Mr. PITTMAN. That was the view I took of it.

Mr. FALL. I do not think the Senator understands the situation. In the first place, Mr. President, there seems to be an idea in the minds of a great many people—and I am not surprised that the opinion should be entertained by the layman, the ordinary citizen, who is busy with his engagements and does not pay any attention to matters of this kind—I am not at all surprised that the opinion exists, because of the propaganda which has been going on in this country for so long, to the effect that it was necessary to force the hand of the Senate of the United States, that they should ratify a peace treaty in order that peace might exist. The fact is that peace exists and has existed, and it becomes the duty of some one in this country to put it in effect, to put it in force; and the signing of a treaty or the ratification of the treaty is not the only method by which peace is brought about.

When war ceases peace exists. War is a status. Peace is a status. Peace is the ordinary status of the people of the earth. War is an extraordinary condition, establishing a status. You do not make war by declaring war. You do not make peace by declaring peace. You make war by fighting. You make peace by ceasing to fight. The rules and regulations under which the peoples of the several Governments will continue to act after the status has been established are embraced in what is known as a treaty of peace, and that is all that we have before us to-day and are considering in the Foreign Relations Committee now.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FALL. For a question; yes, sir.

Mr. PITTMAN. If peace is a question of fact and not of declaration, why is the Senator desirous of having a declaration on the part of the United States until a joint or contemporaneous declaration is made on the part of Germany?

Mr. FALL. Oh, Mr. President, so far as we are concerned—the Senator is a lawyer—this is municipal legislation, applicable to the people, if it is anything, that we are considering here, a sundry civil bill; and if this amendment is not subject to the point of order, then it is purely legislation affecting the people of the United States, and has nothing to do with Germany or whether Germany declares the war to cease or not.

Mr. President, the blockade has been lifted. The different nations of the world are trading with Germany. The President of the United States, if we can believe the public press, is issuing licenses to citizens of the United States enabling them to trade with Germany. The papers have informed us of this fact, and that those who seek licenses may get them at the proper office. If this amendment has any effect whatsoever, it will simply be to place all citizens on an equality, so that under a prosecution for a violation of section 3 of the trading-with-the-enemy act, such a citizen not holding a license issued by the President of the United States can offer the amendment itself in justification for his act.

That is the status of the amendment. If it is subject to a point of order, let the point be raised and the ruling be had. If it is not, let us have a vote.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have just read the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico; and it appears to me that the substance of the amendment is an effort by indirection to declare the status existing between this Government and the Government of Germany, without awaiting the usual course of the ratification of a treaty. It appears to me that there can be but one conclusion as to the purpose of the amendment. It reads as follows:

That the status of peace between the former Imperial German Government and the United States of America being declared to exist, no part of said sum shall be used in enforcing the provisions of section 3 of an act of October 6, 1917, known as the trading-with-the-enemy act.

Now, of course, if we do not desire further to enforce the provisions of the trading-with-the-enemy act we have a right to say so, and withhold those portions of the appropriation in this bill that will probably go to the United States marshals and district attorneys; and it might be in order, if it is not new legislation, for the Congress to make that limitation. The only criticism of that, if that were all that were contained in the body of this amendment, would be as to whether or not we desired to continue in force the terms of the trading-with-the-enemy act.

I understand that under Executive orders at the present time the trading-with-the-enemy act is not being enforced. There

may be some technical orders being issued that it is necessary to promulgate in order to comply technically with the terms of the act; but there is no real effort to restrict trade under the terms of the trading-with-the-enemy act at this time.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. FALL. Unless the terms of section 3 are being complied with, then whoever is allowing such trading is violating the law of the United States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I said that probably some technical blanket orders are being issued to prevent that; but whilst the Senator is on his feet I should like to ask him a question. Would he be willing to consent to strike out of his amendment these words?—

That the status of peace between the former Imperial German Government and the United States of America being declared to exist—

And just let the amendment read as follows:

Provided, That no part of said sum shall be used in enforcing the provisions of section 3 of an act of October 6, 1917, known as the trading-with-the-enemy act.

Mr. FALL. Does the Senator ask me that question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. FALL. I have a little Irish in me. Will the Senator tell me whether, in the event I consent to striking out those words, he will support the amendment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I will support it.

Mr. FALL. Very well, sir. I have no objection to striking them out.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. All right, Mr. President. With that modification of the amendment, I have nothing further to say. I have no desire to keep the trading-with-the-enemy act on the statute books.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. With that modification of the amendment, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. FALL. Of course, I simply desire to say that I am anxious to get results, and that I have consented to strike out that clause for the purpose of getting results. Any other or further purpose I have had has been achieved by offering it as it was in the original words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment as modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

Provided, That no part of said sum shall be used in enforcing the provisions of section 3 of an act of October 6, 1917, known as the trading-with-the-enemy act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the adoption of the amendment as modified.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, in view of the condition of this legislation, I trust that that amendment may not be adopted. While fully in sympathy with the movement, yet I am also in sympathy with these thousands of men and women who are waiting for the compensation due them, and with these establishments that are really going ahead without warrant of law, as they have been doing for more than half of this month. It seems to me necessary that we should at this time pass this bill as it has come to us from the House and take up these other matters at some later day.

Therefore I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I want to say that, of course, the Senator from Wyoming is not at all to blame in this matter; but, nevertheless, I have been misled into the thought that there would be no objection to this proposed amendment if I acceded to the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama. Otherwise I certainly should have endeavored to secure a vote directly upon the question as to whether the Senate of the United States, at least, as one body, is ready to declare its recognition of the fact that peace exists between this country and Germany. Of course now there is no opportunity for me to have the voice of the Senate upon that proposition by virtue of the fact that I have been, not of course caught in a trap, because no one intended to lay any for me—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to say to the Senator that I have had no conference with the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. FALL. I am sure of that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And so far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to vote for the Senator's amendment, and will do so.

Mr. FALL. I am confident that the Senator will; and I was simply expressing my very serious regret that the chairman of the committee had refrained from expressing himself until after the agreement had been reached between the Senator from

Alabama and the Senator from Georgia and myself, and I had agreed to an amendment of the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is reminded that there was a point of order made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] which was pending and not determined upon and waiting until this later consent to change the amendment.

Mr. FALL. Oh, I am not accusing the Senator—

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want the Senator from New Mexico to understand that the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Georgia can not bind the Senate, and that we are not obliged to adopt this amendment because they have agreed on it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. FALL. I have not undertaken to make any such assertion nor any such suggestion. The remark of the Senator is entirely unwarranted. I was simply expressing my personal regret that I had been led into certain action by the suggestion of the Senator. I have criticized no Senator whomsoever, and the Senator from Minnesota should know from our past association that he is the last one in this body whom I would attempt to criticize in any way.

Mr. NELSON. I was surprised, Mr. President, at the language of the Senator. He seemed to intimate that this thing was settled because of the agreement that had been made. I want to say to him that it is not settled for one. There will be one vote against it, anyway.

Mr. FALL. Why, of course; and I want to say that I was very much surprised at the attitude and the language of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota misunderstood me. The Senator from New Mexico withdrew his amendment—that part of it which I thought made it subject to a point of order. Therefore I withdrew my point of order. I still hope that the bill will pass without any amendment at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I am sorry that the Senator from Minnesota seems to think that some of his brother Senators have made an agreement that affects him. My purpose in rising a moment ago was to combat the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico as it stood, because I believed that the language in the amendment at that time involved those very grave questions which affected peace conditions in this country; and, believing that they should only be considered in the proper way in connection with the treaty, I was prepared to resist the amendment on that ground. But I wanted to know the attitude of the Senator from New Mexico, and I asked him as to whether or not he was trying to withhold appropriations from the future carrying on of the trading-with-the-enemy act, or whether the main purpose of his amendment was to affect the peace status of the country. When I asked him if he was willing to strike out those words that related to the peace status of the country, he said he was, but first asked me if I was willing to support the amendment without them, and I said I would; that I was willing to support his amendment if it did not affect questions relating to peace.

That conversation was entirely between the Senator from New Mexico and myself. Of course, it did not affect anyone else in the Senate; and I merely wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, the trading-with-the-enemy act was a very useful piece of legislation when we were in an actual condition of war. I expect and hope that within 30 days the treaty of peace will be ratified by the United States Senate and a technical condition of war will be over, as an actual condition of war is over, and therefore I see no reason in the world why any money should be wasted in carrying on the trading-with-the-enemy act at a time when we have let down the bars for the admission of all classes of goods into the enemy country to-day. By the terms of the agreement entered into in Paris, not waiting for our ratification, the doors are open to Germany for the goods and the trade of every nation on the earth, including ourselves.

Now, I do not believe that the executive branch of the Government will use any of this money to further enforce the trading-with-the-enemy act, but if that were done it certainly would be a waste of public money. Therefore I do not see any harm whatever in adopting the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico and providing that this money shall not be used for that purpose when we do not want it used for the purpose, when we are not going to use it for the purpose, after he has stricken out that section of the amendment which related to the peace status of the two nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. I call for the yeas and nays.
The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIAL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING]. He is absent to-day. I transfer that pair to my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I inquire if the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], and vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] to the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TRAMMELL (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. FERNALD. I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and vote "yea."

Mr. FALL (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HENDERSON (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. KELLOGG. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], who is absent, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] are detained on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]; and

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Borah	Gronna	Lenroot	Poindexter
Cummins	Hale	Lodge	Spencer
Curtis	Harding	McCumber	Sutherland
Dillingham	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Underwood
Fall	Kenyon	New	Wadsworth
Fernald	Knox	Norris	Watson
France	La Follette	Page	

NAYS—33.

Ashurst	Henderson	Pittman	Thomas
Beckham	Hitchcock	Ransdell	Trammell
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Shields	Walsh, Mass.
Culberson	King	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Kirby	Smith, Ga.	Warren
Gay	McKellar	Smith, Md.	Williams
Gerry	Nelson	Smoot	
Harris	Nugent	Stanley	
Harrison	Overman	Swanson	

NOT VOTING—36.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	McNary	Reed
Bankhead	Gore	Martin	Robinson
Brandeggee	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Sheppard
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Sherman
Capper	Kellogg	Owen	Simmons
Colt	Kendrick	Penrose	Smith, S. C.
Edge	Keyes	Phelan	Sterling
Elkins	McCormick	Phipps	Townsend
Fletcher	McLean	Pomerene	Wolcott

So Mr. FALL's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 44, line 18, insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the board is authorized to use of any unexpended balance on hand the sum of \$50,000 for assisting in the construction and equipment of a woman's reformatory institution near Camp Pike, in Arkansas, said board having agreed with the local State authorities to furnish said sum for the purposes upon their supplying a like amount, which has been done.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, while I might under other circumstances not object to this amendment, as I said a moment ago in reference to another matter, I feel that the necessity of passing the bill without amendments of that kind makes it necessary for me to make a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. If there be no further amendment proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. I make the point of order that, having given written notice in compliance with the rule that to-morrow I would offer an amendment, the final vote can not be taken to-day. My notice serves automatically to postpone a final vote on the passage of the bill until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is not well taken.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to be heard for a minute upon the point of order. I had no opportunity to give the notice until to-day. The bill was passed by the House only yesterday afternoon. Prior to that time I did not know but what the bill would be defeated in the House. I had no way of knowing that it would pass the House and come to the Senate, and it was only reported to the Senate to-day. I had no way of knowing what would be in the bill as reported until it was reported to-day. I had no way of knowing what the committee might put in the bill or take out of the bill. I had no way of knowing what the contents of the bill would be until it was reported to-day.

A construction of a rule which would make the rule meaningless and ineffective is not a sound construction of a rule. A rule must be given some construction which will make it operative and effective and which will make it mean something. If you give a rule a construction which destroys the rule, then the construction is unsound, because it would destroy the very subject which you are construing.

If the bill had been up for consideration before the Senate on yesterday, I think it could be justly contended that by giving my notice to-day I was too late, but I had no opportunity to give the notice until to-day. I claim that the rule under which I gave my notice, Rule XL of the Senate, operates so that when a bill is reported to the Senate, if a notice is given of a motion to suspend the rule in order to offer an amendment which is prohibited by the rules, it operates automatically to put the final vote over one day—that is, if it is offered on the day the bill is reported.

If I were to give the notice to-morrow, the bill having been before the Senate to-day, that I would on Monday make this motion, then I would have slept on my rights. But I have had no rights to sleep on heretofore.

I say when the bill is just reported to the Senate this rule places it in the power of any Senator to put the vote over one day if he gives his notice on the same day that the bill is reported, not if he gives notice on a subsequent day, but on the same day he can postpone the vote for 24 hours. You may say if a Senator can do that he can postpone the vote on the bill forever, but that is not sound, because his right to postpone the vote 24 hours is limited to giving a notice on the same day the bill is reported to the Senate, and after that day if he gives a notice he is too late and he has slept on his rights. Unless you take that construction of the rule it simply destroys the right of a Senator to give notice on the same day a bill is reported that he will on the next day move to suspend the rules in order to offer an amendment which is forbidden by the rules. Unless that construction is taken, then a Senator is powerless to give notice that he will move to suspend the rules on the same day the bill is reported if the rest of the Senate is ready to vote that day. Therefore I urge the point of order that the bill can not be voted on to-day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MYERS. Then, Mr. President, I offer the amendment now without notice, and in doing so I will beg the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill not to make a point of order against it, because a delay of one day will not hurt anything in

regard to the bill. I ask that the amendment may be read, so that the chairman of the committee may hear it. I offer it now without notice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Add at the proper place in the bill:

To resume and prosecute work on projects and units thereof under the reclamation act stopped during the war and to begin and prosecute existing projects and units thereof which are practically ready for prosecution, to be immediately available and to be expended under the terms and conditions of the reclamation act, except that in the matter of employment a preference shall be given to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, \$50,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I would like to help my friend the Senator from Montana at the proper time, but I am compelled to make a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MYERS. Then I will offer another amendment, which is materially different. I ask that it be read and hope it may appeal to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Add at the proper place:

To prosecute further work on projects, and units thereof, under the reclamation act, now in course of construction, and to begin and prosecute new projects and units thereof in drought-stricken regions of the United States, to be immediately available and to be expended under the terms and conditions of the reclamation act, except that in the matter of employment a preference shall be given to drought-stricken and suffering homesteaders, farmers, and ranchers, \$5,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I shall have to make a point of order against that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MYERS. I was in hopes the chairman of the committee would not make a point of order against it, as it is for a much smaller sum. Of course, that is a matter for the Chair to rule upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has sustained the point of order.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I can not believe that the Senator's point of order is well taken.

Mr. WARREN. Pretty nearly all points of order lie against it. In the first place, it has not been estimated for; in the second place, it has not been presented to the committee and printed a day beforehand; it is legislation, and it also increases an appropriation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I did not understand the Senator to put his objection on those grounds.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is in the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to renew my point of order that the Senate can not vote on the bill to-day, in view of the notice I have given.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] sustained the point of order, and the Chair will stand by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. MYERS. Then I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana appeals from the ruling of the Chair. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? [Putting the question.] The ayes have it.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARTICLE 10, COVENANT OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I give notice that on Monday, the 28th day of July, at the close of the morning business, I shall address the Senate upon article 10 of the covenant of the league of nations.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT EQUIPMENT FOR ROAD PURPOSES.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, on July 1 the Senate adopted two resolutions—Senate resolution 108 and Senate resolution 109—one directing the Secretary of Agriculture to report the quantity and description of war material, equipment, and supplies, particularly the number and description of cars, trucks, and tractors, which will be required for the use and improvement of highways, and so forth. A supplement or complement to that resolution directed the Secretary of War to report to the Senate the number and description of cars, trucks, tractors, and other war material, equipment, and supplies on hand and which are not needed by the War Department, and so forth. The purpose was to

require these departments to indicate the number of cars that would be required for road purposes and the number that would be available then for sale.

My information was that there were several thousand trucks that were not being properly cared for, and that would so deteriorate as to become of little or no value, whereas if they were properly handled and properly disposed of several millions of dollars might result to the Government. I desire to inquire whether, pursuant to these resolutions, these departments have responded and furnished the information required.

The VICE PRESIDENT. None has come to the hands of the Chair.

Mr. KING. I shall simply content myself with saying that some of these departments are very slow in answering the demands and requests made for information by the Senate. If these departments fail to furnish this information at the next meeting of the Senate I shall ask for the passage of appropriate resolutions which I hope will secure the information called for.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think I ought to say that it will be necessary to keep the Senate in session until the sundry civil bill has been signed by the presiding officers. The bill has gone back to the House, and there will be no delay in signing it, because it is engrossed and ready. In the meantime I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 1 hour and 25 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 7343. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13 to 16, 1919, inclusive.

DEATH OF EDWARD V. MURPHY.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I rise to announce the death of Edward V. Murphy, at Albany, N. Y., on the 16th instant, while en route to Canada, where he hoped he might regain his rapidly failing health. He is to be interred in this city on Monday next.

For almost 60 consecutive years he has been connected with the official stenographic force of the Senate. Mr. Murphy entered upon this work on February 13, 1860, and ever since that time has rendered most faithful and efficient service. His has been a wonderful experience, and his contact with men and measures before and since the Civil War made him a most interesting and instructive figure in and around the Capitol. Always faithful, courteous, and kindly, and holding him, as I did, in the highest regard, I feel constrained to announce the death of this splendid public servant to my colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer the following resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read. The resolutions were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility of the death of Edward V. Murphy, late one of its Official Reporters, and expresses its sense of the fidelity, industry, and ability with which he discharged the duties of his responsible office.

Resolved, That the Secretary transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 21, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 18, 1919.

CONSULS.

CLASS 5.

Edward J. Norton to be a consul of class 5.

CLASS 8.

Harry A. McBride to be a consul of class 8.

Raymond C. Mackay to be a consul of class 8.

William W. Early to be a consul of class 8.

William P. Garrety to be a consul of class 8.

DIRECTOR BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE.

Philip B. Kennedy to be Director Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

FIRST ASSISTANT DIRECTOR BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE.

Roy S. McElwee to be First Assistant Director Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

S. M. Angell to be assistant appraiser of merchandise for customs-collection district No. 20, with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Albert Bollschweiler to be United States Marshal, District of New Jersey.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

George H. Durgin to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Thomas H. Tulley to be collector of customs for customs-collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, July 18, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou everliving God, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; creating, re-creating, upholding, sustaining Thy children in everything that is pure and holy, help us to be too wise to be ignorant, too strong to be weak, too broad to be narrow, too just to be prejudiced, too noble to be mean, too generous to be selfish, too brave to be cowards, that the trend of our life may be Godward in imitation of the world's Great Exemplar. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the report of the committee, headed by ex-Justice of the Supreme Court Charles E. Hughes, on the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in reference to the consultations they have been having the last few days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the report made by the committee on the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

Mr. WALSH. What committee is that—Interstate Commerce—

Mr. RAYBURN. No; a report made by the committee headed by ex-Justice Hughes, which has been through the bureau in the last few days, an expurgated copy of which was found in the newspapers this morning.

Mr. WALSH. Ex-Justice Hughes?

Mr. RAYBURN. And several other members.

Mr. WALSH. The name sounds familiar.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this committee is an unofficial committee, is it not?

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And some society ladies and others are on it, are they not?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, I do not know that that is any reflection on these ladies—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not mean any.

Mr. RAYBURN. They are the heads of great organizations—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But not expert insurance people; rather a social affair?

Mr. RAYBURN. I think ex-Justice Hughes of the Supreme Court is considered a pretty good authority on insurance matters.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman think in a few hours any committee can make an overhauling of that department that would be considered—

Mr. RAYBURN. They do not profess to make any overhauling of the department or a full investigation. This is an advisory committee asked here to consult on certain policies with reference to that bureau.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What is the purpose of getting it in the RECORD at this time?

Mr. RAYBURN. I would like for the Members of the House to have an opportunity of knowing what they say about certain matters set out in this report.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It makes no constructive suggestions?

Mr. RAYBURN. I think they do.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the request of the gentleman from Texas. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture I offer a privileged report on the bill (H. R. 7413) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, reports the bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7413) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DYER. That it is not in order to take it up for consideration at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand the gentleman is offering it for consideration at this time.

Mr. DYER. I wanted to find out if it is proposed to take it up now.

Mr. HAUGEN. I desire to take it up at the earliest possible moment.

The SPEAKER. The bill is ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 7413, being a bill "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920." That the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. That there shall be one hour of general debate, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. That at the conclusion of the general debate the bill shall be read. That the provisions in all paragraphs of said bill shall be in order. That on the reading of the bill no amendments shall be in order except germane amendments to the following paragraph, beginning on line 8, page 102, of said bill:

"That section 3 of the act entitled 'An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States,' approved March 19, 1918, is hereby repealed, effective on the last Sunday of October, 1919, after the approval of this act, when by the retarding of one hour the standard time of each zone shall be returned to and thereafter be the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing each zone as defined in section 1 of said act approved March 19, 1918."

That at the conclusion of the reading of said bill it shall be reported to the House with such amendments as may be made to the paragraph specified as subject to amendment. That thereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question or two.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri for a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What makes you shut out any discussion or amendment of these four other senatorial propositions that were hitched on this bill originally and the House never had any chance to discuss except on the conference report?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That was asked by the Committee on Agriculture after consulting with Members of another body, with a view of expediting the passage of the bill. It was thought it would materially expedite the passage of this bill if the Senate amendments, that would have been subject to a point of order, were made in order and reported as agreed upon by the conferees.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What goes of this great hullabaloo here that we have had about senatorial riders on appropriation bills? Have the Republicans entirely surrendered on that proposition or not?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is not the question immediately before the House at this time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know it is not, and I am trying to get information.